

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH AND J. M. SHERWOOD.

Associate Editors:

ALBERT BARNES, Philadelphia.

ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

JONATHAN B. CONDIT, Auburn Theological Seminary N. Y.



OCTOBER, 1867.

NEW YORK:

WILLIAM SHERWOOD, No. 354 BROADWAY,
(At the Book Store of CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOKSTORE, 1394 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & CO.

POPULAR AND VALUABLE WORKS
JUST PUBLISHED BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.,
No. 654 Broadway, New York.

PROF. WHITNEY ON LANGUAGE.

LANGUAGE AND THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanscrit and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College. One volume, crown 8vo. Price \$2.50.

Prof. Whitney's aim in these lectures is to place in a clearly comprehensible form, before the English reader and student, all the principal facts regarding language—its nature and origin, its growth, its classifications, its ethnological bearing, its value to man. Technical and metaphysical phraseology is avoided as much as possible and the progress of the argument is always from that which is well known, or obvious, to that which is more obscure or difficult. It is believed that the work will be widely adopted as a text-book for instruction.

DAY'S COMPOSITION AND RHETORIC.

THE ART OF COMPOSITION. By Prof. Henry N. Day. 1 vol., 12mo. Price \$1.50.

THE ART OF DISCOURSE. A system of Rhetoric adapted for use in Colleges and Academies, and also for private study. By Prof. Henry N. Day. One vol., 12mo. Price \$1.50.

These works are clear in style, accurate in statement, thoroughly methodical in arrangement and exhaustive in their treatment. In connection with the Logic, by the same author, they make the most complete series of text books in use upon the range of subjects which they cover.

GUIZOT'S MEDITATIONS (Second Series).

MEDITATIONS ON THE ACTUAL STATE OF CHRISTIANITY and on the attacks which are now being made upon it. 1 vol., 12mo. Price \$1.75.

PRAYERS OF MR. BEECHER.

PRAYERS OF HENRY WARD BEECHER—Pulpit, Occasional, and Social. One vol., 12mo. Price \$1.75.

All who have ever enjoyed Mr. Beecher's ministrations have been impressed with the fact that his prayers are the most earnest, effective, and forcible part of his public exercises. The spirit of deep devotion, of filial affection and childlike trust which breathes through those comprised in this volume, will find a response in thousands of hearts.

A NEW WORK BY FROUDE, THE HISTORIAN.

SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS. By James Anthony Froude, M. A. 1 vol., crown 3vo, (Uniform with the History of England.) Price \$3.00

Mr. Froude's great industry, his capacity for analysis and generalization, joined with his graphic power as a writer—qualities which have placed him at the head of living historians—are displayed to admirable advantage in the essays comprised in this volume. They include his contributions to current periodical literature during the last few years, and are all marked by great originality and independence of thought, joined with stirring eloquence of expression.

LANG'S COMMENTARY.

GENESIS, by Prof. Tayler Lewis and Dr. Gorman, with additions (1 vol.); **CORINTHIANS**, by Rev. Drs. D. W. Poor and Conway Wing, with additions (1 vol.); **THESSALONIANS, TIMOTHY, TITUS and HEBREWS** (1 vol.), \$5.00 each.

The Old Roman World. The Grandeur and Failure of its Civilization. By John Lord, LL.D. 1 vol., crown 8vo. Price \$3.00.

In this work Dr. Lord describes, in his peculiarly graphic and nervous style, "the greatness and misery of the old Roman world." The volume will be found entertaining, instructive, and profitable in the highest degree, while it will be specially useful as a text book for higher schools and colleges.

Thanksgiving. By Rev. William Adams, D. D. 1 vol., 12mo. Price \$2.00.

Extemporary Preaching. By F. Barnham Zincke, Vicar of Wrenstead, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. 1 vol. 12mo.

This work will be produced in a style uniform with "Bautain's Art of Extemporary Speaking," which it very appropriately accompanies and supplements.

History of the Church of God during the Period of Revelation. By Rev. Chas. Colcott Jones, D. D. In 8vo vols. Price \$3.50.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Ik Marvel's Rural Studies \$1 75
Froude's History of England. In 10 crown 8vo vols. \$3 each; or, half calf, each 5 00
De Vere's Studies in English. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 2 50
Day's Elements of Logic. Designed for Classes and private study. 1 50
Liber Librorum. Uniform with "Ecce Deus" and "Ecce Homo." 1 vol. 16mo. 1 50
Ritter's Life. By W. L. Gage. 1 vol. 12mo. 1 75
Trench's Studies in the Gospels. 1 vol. 8vo. 3 00
Shedd's (Rev. W. G. T.) Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. 1 vol. 8vo, tinted paper. 3 50

Gibbons's Public Debt. 1 vol. \$2 00
Randolph's (A. D. F.) Hopefully Waiting, and other verses. 1 vol. 16mo. 1 50
Paulding's Literary Life. 1 vol. crown 8vo. Fine Portrait. 2 50
Lang's Commentary. New Volume on the Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude. 1 vol. 8vo. 5 00
Also, **Matthew.** 1 vol. **Mark and Luke.** 1 vol. Acts. 1 vol. each 5 00
Schaff's (Rev. P. D. D.) History of the Christian Church. Being vols. 2 and 3 of "Ancient Christianity." 2 vols. 8vo. 7 50
Also, just Ready, New Edition of vol. 1, same work. 3 75

Copies of the above works will be sent by mail, post-paid, to any address, upon receipt of the price.

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.,
No. 654 Broadway, New York.

in-
der
ons,
008-
n is
.

for
uat-
ries

ade

vers
illal
e in

orm

as a
ran-
ture
with

W.
WS

nam
ordl-

with
h it
s.

the
cott

2 00

1 50

2 50

5 00

5 00

7 50

3.75

886,

ks.



THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES. No. XX—OCTOBER, 1867.

ART. 1.—THE VISION THEORY OF THE RESURREC-
TION OF JESUS CHRIST.

BY REV. WOLCOTT CALKINS, Buffalo, N. Y.

[Continued from No. XIX, page 277.]

We return, now, to the the narratives of this fact in the Gospels and the Acts. It is difficult to repress a feeling of indignation at the unfair criticism these books have received under the pretense of historical research. Ewald, Schenkel and others, hold a theory which corresponds nearer to Mark than to the other Gospels. Therefore, the second Gospel—not the copy which we possess, of course, but the “Urmarcus” of which this is a later corruption—is the original document from which all the others are derived.* Schleiermacher and many of his pupils, with Hase, find their theory of miracles more in accord with John, than with the synoptists; so they hold fast to the fourth Gospel as the work of an eye-witness. Beyschlag, and many of the most determined opponents of the mythical school, seek to avoid the dif-

* Schenkel, Vol. I, 21.

ficulties of harmonizing the synoptists, by selecting one of them, Matthew for instance, as the original source of all, admitting corruptions in the others. Baur, Strauss, Holstein, with the whole negative school, deny, to all of them alike, any historical value. And yet every theory of the resurrection is derived from the very books and the very chapters which its advocates declare to be worthless!* We have seen that the theory of a preparation of feeling and conscience for Paul's conversion finds no support, but the most explicit contradiction, in his own writings. From what source, then, are these conjectures gathered? We can scarcely believe our eyes when we read in their own words the naïve confession that they are gathered from the Acts of the Apostles!† Is that historical criticism? Is it permitted to reject certain books, because they are legendary, and then quote them again to explain away the facts of genuine history? Is the legion of traditions to be cast out of the Gospels, and then turn again to rend them into mythical shreds? The impertinence of this method is only equalled by Renan, who confesses that he derives his theory of three periods in the development of Jesus, *from the Koran!*‡

What would be thought of this method applied to the mythologies of Greece and Rome? Suppose we had letters, unquestionably genuine, from a contemporary of Hercules, alluding to all his labors as facts well known, immediately after his disappearance from the world; suppose the details of these labors were found, not in the poetry of later centuries, but in certain independent narratives known to be in existence a few generations, at the very latest, after the alleged facts took place? Would any honest historian subject these

* For example: Schenkel quotes the "later traditions," to answer objections. II, 316, seq.

† See the citations in *Zeitsch. Wiss. Theol.* 1863: 192, ff.

‡ Introd. This, of course, is only an *argumentum ad hominem*. We shall soon see how falsely the Gospels are cited.

documents to such criticism as Homer, Hesiod and Herodotus, in the absence of all previous history receives? Would not the facts in the case, previously established by the contemporaneous letters, be satisfactory proofs that the narratives were not mythical, but historical? We have no documents of this kind. Hercules is said to have lived before history had any existence among his countrymen. Therefore we have a right to infer that the highly imaginative descriptions of later books are traditions. But Jesus certainly lived in an era of historical writing. The great facts of his life, his death, his burial, and his resurrection the third day, are established by contemporaneous history which our adversaries themselves admit to be genuine, and free from every trace of mythology. Therefore we insist that narratives which profess to give the details of these facts shall be accepted as historical, at least so far as their origin can be traced, and so far as they correspond with things known to exist without their authority.

We shall take for granted, without argument, the external evidences of the early origin of the Gospels. Near the close of the second century they were regarded as Holy Scripture in all parts of the Church. Not later than A. D. 170 a catalogue of the books of the New Testament was made, in which they were found. About this time two translations were in use: the Syriac *Peshito* and the Latin *Itala*, which still survive and correspond to the most ancient and exact text of our Gospels. Those who were now using these books as the genuine writings of the Apostles, had been intimately acquainted with those who had talked with the Apostles. Harmonies of the four Gospels were made. Not later than A. D. 150 heretics in the Church were denying and corrupting the Gospels, and enemies of the Church were trying to bring them into ridicule. About A. D. 110 apocryphal gospels were composed, two of which, at least, we have in our possession, which pre-suppose the existence of the four genuine ones. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Barnabas, and Polycarp, have left writings bearing dates from 95 to 115, in which a few literal quotations are

found, and many hundred allusions, which show their familiarity with the Gospels. In some instances, citations from the Gospels are introduced by the formula, never applied to any books but Sacred Scriptures, "it is written." The inference from these facts, by the best historians of every shade of theological opinion, is that our four Gospels were generally recognized at the close of the first century as the genuine writings of Mathew, Mark, Luke, and John.*

In comparing the narratives of the resurrection in these books with the facts we already know, we observe:

I. They differ from Paul, and from one another, sufficiently to show that they are independent narratives of the same fact.

Of the five appearances mentioned by Paul, the one to James is not recorded at all by the Evangelists, and the one to the Five Hundred is not described so as to be recognized with certainty.† Paul passes in silence the appearance to Mary Magdalene,‡ and to the other women;§ the journey to Emmaus,§ and the meeting at the early twilight of the fishermen in Galilee." Now it is completely indifferent what explanation of these variations is given, or whether any explanation at all is given. Paul may have omitted these facts because he was not acquainted with them, or because these witnesses were fallen asleep when he wrote, or because he had material enough for his purpose without them. His "then," "after that" and "last of all" may denote the strictly consecutive order, as he supposed, or a looser arrangement. Each Evangelist may have related all that he knew, or may have made a selection of the "many signs which Jesus did,"

* Tischendorf, Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst. Leipsic, 1865. Trans. Theolog. Eclectic, 1866: 208.

Citations from the New Testament by the Apostolic Fathers. Bibliotheca Sacra, Oct. 1866.

† Cf. 1 Cor. xv, 6, and Math. xxviii, 16-20.

‡ Math. xxviii, 9.

§ John xxi, 1, ff.

‡ Mark xvi, 9; John xx, 14-

§ Luke xxiv, 13, ff.

§ John xx, 30.

all of which could not be written in all the books in the world.* These questions have their place in criticism, but to the historical question they are absolutely irrelevant. Paul and the Evangelists are in perfect harmony on the facts that he rose again the third day and was seen. They differ in detail just enough to show that they are independent.

And so are the Evangelists independent of one another. Mary and her companions came to the sepulchre very early in the morning, "while it was yet dark;† "as the sun was rising."‡ Here they saw "a young man clothed in white;§ "two men in shining garments.¶ "The Angel was sitting upon the stone which he had rolled away;⁹ and entering into the sepulchre they saw him sitting on the right side.⁵ After our Lord's appearance to these women in Jerusalem, the disciples went to Galilee, and there they saw him and received his instructions and promises.⁶ But he appeared to Peter,⁴ and to two disciples,⁷ and to all the Apostles except Thomas, with many others,⁸ on the third day, in or near Jerusalem; and again on the eighth day, in the same place, Thomas being present with them.⁹ Luke groups together a mass of final instructions, with the particular direction not to depart from Jerusalem till they be endowed with power from on High, without any clear specification of time;¹⁰ while John distinguishes care-

* John xxi, 25.

† John xx, 1

‡ Mark xvi, 2.

¶ Mark xvi, 5.

§ Luke xxiv, 4.

⁹ Math. xxviii, 2.

⁵ Mark xvi, 5.

⁶ Math. xxviii, 16, ff; John xxi, 1, ff.

⁷ Luke xxiv, 34.

⁸ Luke xxiv, 13.

⁹ Luke xxiv, 34, 36; John xx, 19.

¹⁰ John xx, 24, ff.

⁵ If, with Robinson, we must admit no interval between verses 43 and 44 of Luke xxiv, we do not see how we can escape Strauss' objection (293) that this command to tarry in Jerusalem is a contradiction to the command to depart into Galilee. Again, there is no greater mark of an interval between v. 49 and v. 50, than between v. 43 and v. 44. If we are forced by the $\delta\epsilon$ in the former instance to infer continuous time, we must, with Strauss and Schenckel, make Luke place the Ascension on the eighth day, a "mistake which is corrected in the later book of the Acts." We believe that Luke xxiv, 44-49 is a general summary of instructions given on many different occasions, during the forty days.

fully the time and place of each appearance, and the nature of each conversation related by him.*

These are the alleged contradictions, for which it is proposed to reject the Gospels as mythical and traditionary! Even Beyschlag and L. Paul, whose defense of the reality of Paul's Christophany can not be commended too highly, are thrown into confusion by the difficulties of the Gospel narratives. "The German critics appear never to perceive that the records owe their existence to the reality of the facts recorded; they search with wonderful acuteness for every possible extrinsic consideration for the telling of a story. They look everywhere but at the facts related, to solve the "secret of their having passed into history."† The facts related are precisely such facts as must give occasion to these variations in the narratives. The true historian has not the slightest interest in the controversy between those who make ingenious attempts to harmonize these four narratives, and those who insist that they can not be harmonized. It is enough that they all agree with Paul and with one another upon the facts that he rose the third day, and was seen many times; that no one denies what any other asserts—for instance, that he appeared to James, and to women, in Galilee and in Jerusalem; that there were two angels, etc. Their variations, however formidable to the harmonist, are absolutely insignificant to the historian, and seem as nothing compared with the contradictions of the most careful and truthful reporters of any of the battles in our recent war.

No, not insignificant. They afford the strongest assurance that these narratives are truthful, furnished by eye-witnesses, and independently of each other. What if the most complete

* For a full and exaggerated array of these supposed discrepancies, cf Strauss, 287-295; Schenkel, Vol. ii, 304-310; and the Wolfenbuttel Fragments.

† Furness, in a concluding note to Schenkel, ii, 359. This is the way he treats his author from beginning to end. The Professor may complain that it is an *oversetting*—*über setzung*—rather than a translation of his work; but the lover of truth will be thankful for even a mild antidote with the poison.

harmony, in all the specifications of time and place, reigned throughout the documents which we possess? How the modern critic would triumph then! With what assurance would the assertion be made that the Gospels lack the coloring of individuality, and are nothing but the later traditions of the mythical period of Christianity? * There are several unguarded admissions of this in Strauss. He sometimes speaks of the variations as unimportant. † He intimates that all difficulties would disappear from the Gospels if we could open them with the certainty beforehand that the resurrection was an actual occurrence. ‡ Precisely this certainty we actually possess in historical monuments, independent of the Gospels, and if it were possible to make certainty more certain, they would do this by their agreement in fact, and their individual coloring in circumstances. §

II. The Gospels supply the full description of facts which are briefly recorded by Paul. The facts being known already, the descriptions are precisely such as we should expect, and render the hypothesis of a mythical origin incredible.

The advocates of the Vision Theory assume that all the appearances of Jesus took place in Galilee. They all admit, without exception, that such a strange hallucination could never have occurred in Jerusalem, where every thing was suggestive of hopes blasted by shame and death. It was the

* Güder, *Bul. Theol.* p. 88.

† Unwesentlich, 602.

‡ P. 289. This is a remarkable confession that he is not engaged in any historical research, but is going about the task of explaining away history, with merciless criticism, to make room for a preconceived theory. Perhaps this justifies Wescott in dismissing "die Evangelien frage" with the brief note on p. 137: "If the resurrection be admitted on other grounds to be a fact, no one will question the general veracity of the Evangelists." It shows the accuracy of the method we have pursued, of establishing the fact first, without the slightest reference to the Gospels.

§ "The very thing on which every rejection of the resurrection, as a historical fact, must be supported, that is, the contradictions in the evangelical narratives, is precisely no support at all to the hypothesis." Hase, *Leben Jesu*. 4te Aufl. § 118. Trans. p. 233.

well-remembered scene of his triumphs which stirred their hearts to an ecstasy of hope in his promises.

But nobody denies the testimony of Paul "that he was buried." Where was the grave? In Jerusalem, unquestionably. Is it conceivable that they can believe in the resurrection without first ascertaining whether the body is still in the tomb? Will their enemies suffer such a belief to be proclaimed, when they can produce, in an hour, the evidence of its falsehood? "Perhaps he was not buried in a place which could be identified. He may have been taken away with those who were executed with him, to some dishonored spot, so that his disciples had no opportunity to seek after his body. And, as for his enemies, the resurrection was proclaimed to them so long after his death (seven weeks!), that they would find it difficult to produce the body and dispel the illusion. Besides, the Jews were so shy of a corpse that this would not suggest itself to them so readily as we might think."* "Not so; the place of the sepulchre was known to hundreds. The belief that it was found empty the first day of the week could not have arisen and continued uncontradicted, if the fact had not been really so. And this is a grave difficulty to our theory that the body of Jesus was not actually alive. We admit that this difficulty can not be satisfactorily explained; still we must remember that it is impossible, now, to determine whether the burial by Joseph of Arimathea was not, after all, a temporary provision; and what became of the body afterwards no one can tell. If the disciples went to Galilee immediately after the crucifixion, which is highly probable,† and did not return till Pentecost, this would considerably diminish the embarrassment which our theory encounters from the open grave. The story would then rest upon the reports of those highly excited women who were left behind."‡ This is the

* Strauss, 312.

† He cites Mark xvi, 7, here; and afterwards Luke xxiv, 33, to prove that they were not immediately scattered.

‡ Schenkel, *Charact. Jesus*, II, 313. *Algem. Kirchl. Zeitschr.* 1865: 302.

best method which skeptical theories find to fill out Paul's epitome of history, "he was buried, the third day he rose again." But a book has come down to us from the first century which answers every question which Paul's allusion suggests. It tells us exactly where the grave was—"nigh at hand." It is described with wonderful precision. It is visited early on the morning of the third day, and found to be open. The report of this brings two disciples to the spot; we see them running, and observe which arrives first, which enters the grave first, which "believes" and which only "wonders." We see the linen grave-clothes lying without any signs of confusion, and the napkin wrapped together in a place by itself. What mythical narrative ever entered into such detail as this? Who could have written these things, save "that disciple whom Jesus loved?" That open grave has proved to be a monument of the truth more inconvenient to modern skepticism than to the Jews themselves. They had no scruples in circulating the wretched slander of the stolen body. But what can men say of this sepulchre, who hold the theory of honest delusion? He was dead, and buried in a place known to hundreds. All Jerusalem, and all readers of history, can satisfy themselves of the truth by running to the sepulchre and "looking in." Where is the dead body? No true historian can come away from that tomb without the belief of John, or, at the very least, the "wonder" of Peter.

The Gospel of John explains, what Paul unmistakably implies, that the belief in the resurrection did begin in Jerusalem and at the very grave of the crucified. Therefore deception was impossible and the resurrection was actual and physical.

Again, the Vision-theorists are unanimous in admitting that considerable time would be demanded for the intellectual process of developing the first fancy into full credulity. Long musings and gradual reversings of their despondency, would at last transform their germs of hope into ripe delusions. But here they are met with the emphatic assertion of the history

which they dare not challenge—"he rose again *the third day*." True, they never quote this accurately. They always say, what Paul never says, Peter and James and the rest *believed* that he rose the third day. Still, there stands the fact, in their own chosen authority, that this belief began on the third day. The attempt to force upon Paul the admission that this date might have been fixed by a later tradition, is an insufferable perversion of the text. Now in what way could this belief begin on this day, unless he was seen on this day? This is the proof of the fact in general which Paul gives. This must be the proof which he intends to give for his date. His testimony could not be more explicit, then, if he had made use of the tautology, "he rose again the third day, and he was seen by Cephas the third day, then by the twelve the third day; *after that** he was seen by about five hundred."†

Paul leaves us, then, with a mere allusion to a well-known proof, which he had often "delivered" orally, that he rose again the third day. We naturally desire to have this proof more in detail. We find it in writings which bear the same evidence of antiquity as Paul's letters. They tell us with that exactness which contemporaneous annals always contain, and without a trace of mythical ornament, how loving woman saw and embraced the living Saviour, at the very moment when they came to anoint his dead body before corruption should begin; how he was seen by Peter the same day, and walked in familiar converse with two others; and in the evening came and stood in the midst of the twelve. Everything is in perfect harmony with the facts we already know; and everything we do not know is supplied in the most natural manner. The belief in the resurrection, whether it be vision or reality, was firmly fixed on the third day after his burial. Therefore, on the confession of our adversaries, the dead body

* Not *eîra*, but *ἐπειρα*.

† And yet Strauss ridicules the assertion that any date for the belief in the resurrection can be fixed from Paul's authority, *Zeitschr. für Wiss. Theol.*, 1863: 387.

of the Saviour was raised to life, as the belief could not exist so soon without the fact.

Again, they admit that the expectations which induced this belief could not be formed without resorting to the prophecies of their Scriptures, that God would not leave his Holy One to see corruption. Paul is supposed to imply that they prepared themselves for their conviction in this way, by the expression "he rose again, according to the Scriptures." But we have already shown, from Paul's epistles, that they did not understand the Scriptures concerning a suffering Messiah, until after the resurrection. It was the fact of the resurrection which made a complete transformation in their opinion of the prophecies, not the prophecies which led them to believe in the resurrection. All this is perfectly certain from the epistles of Paul.

Still, we would gladly know how they began to find and to rest upon these wonderful predictions, sealed up so long to their blinded and sensual nation. We do know all this. Once more the venerable Gospels come in to supply the missing link. The stranger walking to Emmaus with those who had given up all confidence that the Redeemer had come beginning at Moses and the Prophets, expounded unto them how the Christ ought to suffer these things and enter into his glory; then their hearts burned within them. First Christ himself opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures,* then they remembered his own promise to rise again. First the risen Redeemer shed down upon them the spirit that was in all the prophets; then they began at the same Scriptures to preach Jesus. The facts are precisely the reverse of the theory; the order is always first seeing and hearing Jesus, then recollecting the Scriptures.

But this investigation how or when or where these expectations might have been formed, is wholly superfluous. For we have the direct testimony from historical sources,

* Luke xxiv, 45; John xx, 9.

which the most venturesome criticism can not challenge, that no such expectation existed. The undesigned proof of this from Paul's epistles has been alluded to above. That there was no such expectation in the spirit of that age and nation, is shown at length, and with unanswerable arguments, by Westcott.* We have then, on the one hand, the pure conjecture, with no support from Scripture, in violent contradiction of history; and, on the other hand, the narrative of the Gospels, in perfect harmony with what we already know, and flooding with light all that is left by other documents in obscurity. Follow the Magdalene and her sister in sorrow, turning from their last sad look at the sepulchre to their desolate home. On the way they purchase sweet spices to embalm their beloved.† Were they then expecting that he would rise again? With the earliest dawn, when the Sabbath is passed, they hasten back to the dearest spot on earth to them. But they double their grateful offerings to the dead.‡ Have they yet begun to look for His resurrection? To their relief they find the stone rolled away. Does that give them hope? They look in. He is not there! This surely stirs the eager expectations. Why then that hurried report to Peter and John, that disconsolate return to the empty tomb, that wringing of hands and hopeless wail—"they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him?" No mother, to-day, weeping by the grave of her first-born would be so bewildered and amazed to hear the voice now so silent lisp again her name, as Mary was to hear those tones of measureless love. For the Christian has an expectation that the loved and lost will rise again. Mary had none—none. Ah, the desolation, the death of hope, blackness of despair, in that life which had nothing more to do but anoint a dead Saviour with the kisses and sweet incense of deathless remembrance! Was there ever a perverſion of history so monstrous, as this torturing of the broken

* p. 100, ff.

† Luke xxiii; 56.

‡ Mark xvi; 1.

heart of Mary, the obstinate unbelief of Thomas, and the merciless hostility of Saul, into an expectation that Jesus would appear to them alive! *

We have thus seen that the Gospels contain no facts which we do not know on other evidence; and supply all those circumstances of time, place and progress in the revelation of these facts which are suggested by Paul, with a fullness of detail and absence of exaggeration, which excludes the possibility of a mythical origin, and obliges us to accept them as the writing of contemporaries and eye-witnesses.

There is only one thing more which could render the refutation of the Vision Theory more overwhelming. No one can dispute, of course, the abstract possibility of such visions. Is it not a curious fact, then, that this theory has never been proposed until this late day? It has been proposed before. It is as old as the report of the stolen body. This very Vision Theory, in every form it has assumed, was started on the morning of the resurrection! And by whom? By the Pharisees, the murderers of Jesus? No. Truth is stranger than fiction. It was at first the conjecture of the Apostles themselves! When the first witnesses came with their circumstantial account of the appearance of Jesus alive, "their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not."† This word *λῆρος*, used no where else in the New Testament, was frequently employed in classic Greek, like the Latin *ungæ*, to denote the trifling nonsense of visionary people, never as the designation of intentional deceptions. It is joined by Plato with *παιδιαί*, childish pastimes, and by Demosthenes with *φλυαρίαι*, fooleries. The Apostles refused

* For Strauss and Schenkel do not content themselves with dismissing these reports as "later additions to the narrative" or "pure myths." As remarked before, they use these materials in constructing their theories. Schenkel makes the story of the open grave to depend upon the word of these "highly excited women." The first belief in the resurrection, and, of course, the first expectation of it, was formed, according to Strauss, in the imagination of a poor shattered woman.

† Luke xxix; 2.

to believe these women, then, not because they suspected them of deliberate liars, but because their words seemed to them to be the incoherent talk of persons under bewildering excitement. Now, is it credible that they work themselves into this same illusion in a few hours, and set the seal of their own blood to these "idle tales?" If they were forced to abandon this theory on the third day in Jerusalem, what must we think of the credulity of those who receive it in Tübingen after eighteen centuries.

The attempt has often been made to provide a sort of Proteus escape from the absurdities and contradictions of this theory, by a slight modification of it. Failing to find any satisfactory evidence of delay, removal from Jerusalem, and preparation for the subjective vision, rationalists suggest the vision may have been objective, and hence the beginning of the whole process of recollection, struggle, and searching of Scriptures, which resulted in complete credulity. Strauss keeps this as a *dernier ressort*, if he is driven from his favorite position.* With all pure rationalists, this objective appearance must be traced to some natural cause; lightning on the road to Damascus, a fellow traveler to Emmaus who is deeply read in the Scriptures, a stranger on the shore of the sea who gives lucky advice to tired fishermen. Others are willing to assign to the vision a miraculous origin, provided it be any other miracle than the resurrection of the dead body of Jesus. Something did appear to the women at the sepulchre. The story spread like wild fire, and inflamed all hearts. The same revelation was repeated at rare intervals. This was the origin of the first agitation and of expectations, which were gradually developed into full credulity.

This conjecture avoids some of the strongest contradictions of the Vision Theory, and it may be that such fanaticism is not without example in history. We have no need of discussing the abstract possibility of such visions, nor of scrutiniz-

* 307, 8.

ing the consistency of those who substitute for a supernatural work of God which would lead men to the truth, another not less supernatural which leads them into delusion,* for this is a question of fact, not of possibility nor of probability. If the Disciples fell into such an illusion as this, somebody would have charged it upon them before this time. Supernatural visions of this kind were very common among the Prophets, and continued through the apostolic age. Peter and Paul and the whole Church were accustomed to them. They often took the form of men, and of men well known. Paul saw the vision of the man of Macedonia. The Disciples at Jerusalem when told that Peter stood at the door, said it is his angel.† The Apostles, then, were far more disposed than any modern skeptic to believe that visions in the form of Jesus might appear after his death, *and they did believe it*. This modification of the Vision Theory was held by them until they were forced by unmistakable facts to abandon it. The story of Emmaus was not believed. On the evening of the third day while they were talking about these strange reports,‡ Jesus himself stood in the midst of them and said, "peace be unto you." But they clung to the Vision Theory still. "They supposed it was a Spirit they were seeing"—the very conjecture of Schenkel, that Christ was convincing them by a miracle of his continuous personal existence in Spirit. Then came the patient, long-continued examination, by touching and handling and beholding his wounded hands and feet.

* Cf. Westcott, on the question: "What miracles are antecedently probable." p. 376.

† Beyschlag gives an exhaustive criticism of these visions. He describes many of them as subjective, which are hardly so represented in Scripture. Yet the whole essay is very suggestive.

‡ Luke xxiv; 36. This can only mean that they fully believed them, for Mark is explicit, xvi, 13, that they did *not* believe. There is no need of entering upon the question of the genuineness of Mark xvi, 9—20. It is perfectly clear from all the Gospels, that the Disciples did not believe till they had seen Jesus. The epistles confirm this truth. To be an Apostle was to be a witness of the resurrection.

But even this did not satisfy them. By one of those sudden revulsions so strange and yet so characteristic of our nature, the very exultation which now succeeded to their despair, disturbed perfect confidence. "They still believed not for joy." Infinite patience condescends to the final test. "Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish and an honey comb, and he took it and did eat before them." *

But there was one of them who had absented himself from them, probably out of disgust for these idle tales. Thomas preferred to believe that all the friends he had in the world were deceived by visions of Jesus speaking, walking and eating with them, rather than that Jesus himself was alive. All these illusions were more credible to him than the fact of the resurrection. We are often asked why Jesus did not reveal himself to those who did not believe on him. Excellent answers have been given, all founded on his own words in life: † If they would not repent under his instructions then, neither would they believe though one should be sent to them from the dead. ‡ But, after all, there is no force in the objection. He did reveal himself to those who no more believed in his bodily resurrection than the Pharisees and Strauss and Schenkel and Holsten. Never man lived who refused more stoutly to believe this, on the testimony of others, than Thomas. But at last Jesus came to him and said: "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing. Then Thomas answered and said, My Lord and my God!" Shall we count ourselves unworthy of the blessing promised to those who have not seen and have believed?

III. The Gospels are in harmony with Paul's Epistles, and supplementary to them, in representing the risen body of Jesus to be the identical body which was in the grave, and, at

* Luke xxiv, 36-43.

† Luke xvi, 31.

‡ Neander, *Life of Christ*, Trans., p. 428. Güder. *Bul. Théol.*, 1866; 102.

the same time, a glorious substance raised above the limitations of matter, essentially imperishable and immortal.

We have already shown that Paul associates the resurrection of Jesus with his suffering and death; that it is always described as a miracle accomplished "by the power of God;" and that it is the essential victory of the Divine will over the weakness of the flesh, and over the grave. This language is utterly incomprehensible, if Paul believed that the dead body of Jesus was still in the grave. He asserts as explicitly as human language can assert anything, that the very body which was buried did rise again to life. But not to the life of infirmity and suffering which it had been before. It is a "body" still, but a "glorious body, a spiritual body" now. This plain meaning of the words employed is still more apparent from the purpose for which they are introduced. Three great truths are made to repose upon the foundation of Christ's risen life: the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and the unity of the Church. When the forgiveness of sins is made dependent upon the fact of Christ's resurrection,* this fact is the completion of redemption in the sufferings of Christ; this inseparable work of atonement forbids the conjecture of a physical death and only a spiritual resurrection. When the change of our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, is ascribed to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto himself,† this can be nothing but a mocking delusion, if the hope of coming forth from the grave into an imperishable life of body, mind and soul, be not well founded on such a resurrection of Christ. The description of the bodies in which those who now sleep in Christ shall come forth at his command,‡ expressly founded upon the fact that Christ is already risen in such a body, involves the apparent contradiction of a life which is identical with a former existence, and yet transformed into a spiritual and immortal substance.§

* Rom. i. 4; vi. 5; 1st Cor. xv. 17.

† Phil. iii. 21; 1st Cor. xv. etc.

‡ 2 Thes. v. 23.

§ 1 Cor. xv. 35-56.

And when the Church is described as the Body of Christ, this bold language, whether it be figurative or mystical, can evidently be drawn from nothing but the existence of an actual and glorious Body. The united life of Christians, the mutual offices they owe one another, and the flowing of their life from the one Head who is in Heaven, are conceptions full of grandeur to one who believes that the body of the Saviour, which bore all our iniquities down to the gates of death, is raised up by the power of God and clothed with immortality; but one who believed that this body was long since crumbled to dust, might have called the Church the Spirit of Christ, or the Communion of Christ—never the Body of Christ.*

When we turn from these doctrines and prophecies, so full of hope, to the descriptions of the appearance of that glorious body, even before it was ascended to the Father, we can not fail to remark the similarity. The body of Jesus is indeed a real body of flesh and bones,† receiving the adoring caresses of the believing, and submitting to the searching examination of the unbelieving, walking by the hour together, speaking in familiar tones which snatch away the tearful veil from responding eyes, breaking and even eating bread with the beloved. And yet while the new life seems thus to take up into itself all the elements of the past, it is transfigured by a glorious change. It “shrinks from a too human touch.”‡ Appears the same hour in places remotely distant, rises up suddenly in

* 1 Cor. xii, 12, 13; Eph. iv, 12. The confidence with which Schenkel quotes many passages of this kind, in proof that Paul knows nothing of any but a spiritual resurrection, is perfectly astonishing. *Allgem. kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1865, 302, 3.

† Never—of flesh and blood, which could not enter the kingdom of God. “The significance of the omission of blood, the symbol and seat of corruptible life, must have been at once intelligible to Jews, accustomed to the provisions of the Mosaic ritual, and nothing would have impressed upon them more forcibly the transfiguration of Christ’s body.” Westcott, 139; cf. *Ellicott Life of Christ*, sub loc.

‡ *Ellicott on John xx*, 11.

the midst of assemblies protected by barred doors from the intrusion of enemies, and vanishes as suddenly from the eager gaze of friends. Surely all this is mysterious enough, without adding, as all rationalists have done, that the body is represented as coming through the pores of the doors.* That the doors could be opened and they not know it;† or, to leave the matter exactly as it is stated in the Gospels, that Jesus could come, and disappear again, the doors being closed; that he could live, save at the rare intervals when he chose to reveal himself, in complete isolation from the human race; and then, after he had removed the doubts of all his disciples, and given them his final commissions and promises, that he could lead them beyond the scene of his struggle and anguish to a region consecrated by his greatest miracle of love, and there slowly rise in the air, his hands stretched out in blessings, his eyes flaming with the brightness of omniscient purity, his whole form like the sun shining in his strength, until he enters a cloud fringed with the splendors of the receding sun—all this is indeed the mystery of mysteries! But is this a contradiction? Would not the history of such an event without mysteries be a self-evident contradiction? Ought not the risen Redeemer to appear in the same flesh and bones which had been crucified, but no longer the victim of death nor the prisoner of mortal limitations, bearing away to heaven, rather, this foul captivity captive? That victory was not complete when the first witness was about to fall at his feet in adoration. "Cling not to me," was his loving reproof to her whose eyes he had opened by a familiar word, "for I am not yet ascended to my Father."‡ No love, however true, which sought to keep him as he was seen on

* Strauss, 608, 609, etc. Schenkel II, 312. Nothing can better illustrate the plausible, and yet entirely false, citations they make from the Gospels, than their change of the simple fact, "Jesus came, the doors being shut," into the conjecture, "Jesus came through the closed doors."

† Robinson, Bib. Sac. May 1845, p. 292, ff.

‡ John xx, 17. Rom. vi, 4.

earth, could know the fullness of Christ's majesty. It is no contradiction, but the only credible statement of the fact, to represent that the body was recognized as the same flesh and bones which had been buried, and yet free from all earthly limitations, and speedily transfigured in heavenly glory. That we cannot comprehend a fact so transcending all the analogies of our experience is indeed true. But when Sadducees tell us we can not believe it to be a fact, we require no other answer than that which is written, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God."

Final result.—There are several narratives of the resurrection and successive appearances of Jesus to his disciples. They are admitted by all to be works of the highest antiquity. We have examined them in the light of facts which we know from other sources. They contain variations in regard to times and circumstances, which show that they are independent of Paul's Epistles and of one another; and yet they are in perfect harmony in regard to the fact that Christ rose from the dead, and was seen in Jerusalem the third day after his burial. They contain minute details of these facts which could not possibly be observed and recorded by other than eye-witnesses, and yet they are absolutely free from the grotesque exaggerations of mythology. Therefore the resurrection of Christ, previously ascertained on other grounds to be an actual fact, is not only the unanswerable proof that the Gospels are the writings of apostles and disciples, but is itself a miracle of such transcendent power as to demand all the mysteries expressed in the New Testament.

The Vision Theory of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, is the most formidable attack that has ever been made upon the truth of the Christian religion. We record the fact with a feeling of unspeakable relief. If this is the worst that skepticism can say; if, in order to say this, everything that skepticism has been saying for eight hundred years must be refuted and exposed to ridicule, who can doubt that the Word will remain steadfast which at the first began to be spoken by

the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them which heard him, God also bearing additional testimony with them,* by signs and wonders and divers miracles and by gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his will?

In addition to the superficial criticism, and incessant contradictions involved in the theory, there is one feature of it which has been evident enough at every step, and ought to be emphasized in conclusion. It professes to be a research strictly historical. More than thirty years ago, Strauss boasted of his fitness to enter upon a fair investigation of the facts of history without the slightest interest in the result. "No amount of learning will suffice to achieve anything in the domain of criticism without the internal liberation of the feelings and the intellect from all dogmatic presuppositions."† This independence all rationalists of the present day profess to have attained.‡ The man who sets out with the supposition that the dead body of Jesus was raised to life, may be a Christian and a theologian, but he can not be a historical critic; nor can the man make any pretense to scientific research in the domain of history, who begins with the contrary supposition that Jesus did not rise from the dead. If an impartial investigation shows that we have the testimony of a sufficient number of eye-witnesses who do not contradict each other in regard to the main question at issue, then the fact is proved in such a way as to make the untruthfulness of such testimony more incredible than the occurrence itself.§

What must be the amazement of the candid reader, after these grand promises, to find that everything is taken for granted after all! A miracle is impossible!||. Historical investigation has nothing to do with the supernatural!° That any book professes to relate an event which breaks the sequence of natural causes, *is sufficient in itself to prove that such*

* *συν-επι-μαρτυροῦντος*. Heb. ii, 4.

† Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, trans. I. 4. ‡ Cf. Schenkel, I, Preface, pp. xxiii, xxiv.

§ Strauss, p. 289.

|| *Ib.* p. 13.

° *Ib.* p. 29.

*a document is not historical!** For the necessary laws of scientific history forbid the recognition of any event which results from the personal interposition of the divine will.† The conception of a supernatural power over the spiritual life of the individual, is a direct contradiction to its own nature.‡ This is the "dogmatic presupposition" of all who deny the reality of Christ's bodily resurrection. Renan professes to admit the possibility of miracles, denying only that any miracle has been proved. But when he comes to state the proofs which he would demand, he reduces the historian to a chief of police taking for granted that everything is false which he can not prove with his eyes to be true. So, after all, he does say that a miracle is historically impossible. Schenkel professes to admit the possibility of miracles and to put every miracle to the test. The test—assumed without argument—is the "dogmatic presupposition" that Jesus could not have appeared to his disciples in the flesh and bones that were in the grave and at the same time in a body not subject to death nor to the laws of matter. This double miracle is impossible.§ We insist, therefore, that these men shall not arrogate to themselves the honored name of historical critics. Their method is purely dogmatical, and absolutely contradictory to impartial research. They will not even investigate the most vital question in the history of mankind—Was the best man who ever lived crucified, dead, buried, and raised to life again? They will not admit within the domain of abstract possibility, much less of historical fact, the very question which they in common with all men and the angels of heaven profess a "desire to look into." If they were perfectly ingenuous they would state the question thus: *On the supposition that the dead body of Jesus did not come forth alive from the grave*, how is the fact to be accounted for that the apostles and a multitude of hon-

* Strauss, p. 30.

† Ib. p. 146.

‡ Holsten, Zeitschr. für Wiss. Theol. 1861, p. 224.

§ Allgem. kirchl. Zeitschr. 1865, 296-298.

est men believed that they saw him alive after his burial?*

This theory, then, is nothing but a remorseless attempt to wrest the unquestionable facts of history into harmony with the positive materialistic philosophy of the day. Two principles of philosophy are now in strife.† One is the dogma of the wretched Edmund :

“Thou, Nature, art my Goddess!” ‡

The life of man, and the history of the world are nothing but processes of nature, in which the immortal soul and a personal God, with everything which arises from their mutual relations, have no room. The other is the principle of moral ascendancy over nature, and resting on this ascendancy, the knowledge and experience of a self-dependent kingdom of the immortal spirit ; a kingdom where God reigns, and every soul created anew after his image, lives in him. The struggle between these two principles has of late very naturally been most decisive on the field of Christ's life and person. For here, if anywhere, must the question be settled, whether the history of the world be nothing but a higher process of nature, or the grand drama of the sundering and reconciling of divine and human freedom. Once let him who had not his like among the thousands of thousands in all history, bow himself down before the impassable law of nature ; let him be the highest, if you please, but only the highest product of human nature, who must, like all the rest of us, sink under the curse of sin and death—then our faith, and all the principles germinating in faith, become an intangible, beautiful dream. But let this dreary materialism be wrecked upon the rock of ages, let the supernatural origin and character of his life be triumphantly vindicated against all the cavils of natural science, then we have in him this curse of mere nature taken away

* The reader is referred to Westcott for a discussion of the credibility of miracles, in connection with the resurrection. Also, the position of the resurrection as a central point of all previous and subsequent history.

† Beyschlag.

‡ Lear, Act I, Sc. 2.

from all mankind in all time ; then we have in the miracle of his person a basis for belief in a supernatural world, and a new and living way to reach that world ourselves, which, with all our sin, we feel to be our own sweet home. Here, then, we have the significance and worth of the miracle, the bug-bear of modern rationalism. It is the only possible victory of the Spirit over Nature. Every true miracle is a proof of the victorious power of the Divine Spirit and the Holy Will over the curse of nature to which we are doomed by sin, and therefore a promise of our redemption from sin. But the miracle of miracles is Christ himself. And in no one miracle of his life is the whole character of the miracle so completely concentrated as in his resurrection. If Christ be not risen, then the last appalling proof is sealed that the natural law of death is stronger than the holiest life, stronger even than the power of God. Then the surest confidence is shaken that

"The soul that rises with us, our life's star
Cometh from afar,
Not in entire forgetfulness,
Not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home."*

For if we sink to nothingness, we came from nothingness, and are not the offspring of God. If Christ be not risen, then everything which his life and suffering have promised us, is forever lost. For a dead Saviour can not share with us, can not beget in us, everlasting life. Then everything is lost which we have hoped for in his name. For if his holiest life has not overcome death, how can we expect that our poor life shall conquer death in the last dreadful hour?

But if Christ be risen, then upon our faith is set God's own imperishable seal of confirmation. There is such a thing as a miracle ; there is a higher world ; there is a Redeemer from the curse of sin and death ; and this Redeemer even dared to stand side by side with us in the humiliation of this life for a

* Wordsworth, Ode on Childhood.

little while that we might dare to walk through the valley and shadow of death, and breathe out our life into his own welcoming love. Or, to express all this in the sweeter words of his own Spirit :

"If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them which slept. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

ART. II.—CHRISTIAN FORGIVENESS.

By REV. ARTEMAS DEAN, Hartford, Conn.

I. What is Christian Forgiveness? A brief examination of the words used in the original Scriptures to express the idea of forgiveness, will assist us in framing an answer to this inquiry.

In the Old Testament, the word כָּפַר is used in four places, in which our translators give the rendering, *to forgive* or *pardon*. כָּפַר means *to cover*; *to expiate*; *to forgive*. Elsewhere and almost without exception, whenever the Old Testament writers would speak of forgiveness, as exercised by either God or man, they employ נָשָׂא or סָלַח. The principal renderings of נָשָׂא are *to take up*; *to take away sin*, (in the sense of atonement), *to forgive*. סָלַח means, primarily, *to lift up*; and, secondarily, *to forgive*.

In the New Testament, we find the idea of forgiveness expressed in one place (Luke vi, 37) by the word ἀπολύω, the original meaning of which is *to let go*. In all other instances in which the Saviour speaks of the pardon of sin, he employs

the word ἀφίημι, *to send forth*. In the Acts the same word is used; and in the Epistles, sometimes ἀφίημι and its derivatives are employed, and sometimes χαρίζομαι, *to gratify*; from the root χάρις, *grace, a gift*.

It will be found, upon examination, that the words are used in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures in the sense of forgiveness, indifferently, whether the act of forgiveness is performed by God or man. Forgiveness is one and the same thing, by whomsoever it is exercised; otherwise, forgiveness on the part of God would be expressed by one word, and forgiveness on the part of man would be expressed by a different word. That which is "taken away," "sent forth," "covered," in the pardon of sin, is the sin itself. The transgressor is henceforth as if he had not sinned. In the eye of the offended party the sin has no longer an existence. It is removed out of the way; it is forgotten; it is forgiven.

The way is now prepared to consider the question, what is Christian Forgiveness? In other words, what is the forgiveness which we are required to exercise toward those who have offended us?

To this we answer, in the first place, that forgiveness does not consist in the giving up of unkind feelings toward an offender. Many think that if they are not burning with hatred against one who has injured them, if they are not carried away with the desire of revenge, but are willing to leave the punishment of the evil-doer in the hands of God, it follows, of course, that they possess a forgiving spirit. But it is evident that, while true forgiveness is utterly inconsistent with the exercise of malignant feelings, the uprooting of these evil passions is not itself forgiveness. For since God has no wicked, revengeful feelings to give up, if forgiveness consisted in the putting away of such feelings, forgiveness with Him would be an impossibility; for He can not put away what He never had. But God does forgive; and this proves that forgiveness does not consist in the mortification of evil passions.

What God gives up in forgiveness is not something wrong

in Himself, but the wrong committed by the transgressor. So, also, when we exercise forgiveness, we give up, not our own wrong-doing, but the wrong of another. We pass by the sin committed against us. The spirit of forgiveness is, indeed, thoroughly incompatible with the spirit of revenge; but if I put away malevolent feelings which I have been harboring toward one who has injured me, in so doing, I am simply discharging the duty of repentance for my my own sin, instead of forgiveness for the sin of another. My first duty is to repent; but repentance is not forgiveness.

The question recurs: What then is forgiveness? What is meant by the putting away of the sin of one who has done us a wrong? To this we answer, that we forgive our offender, when we regard and treat him as if he had done no wrong. He may have defrauded us; he may have slandered us; he may have assailed our friends in estate or in reputation, and wounded us through them; but whatever the offense of which he is guilty, however inexcusable and aggravated his fault, or however bitterly we may have mourned over its consequences, if we would forgive him, we must restore him to our esteem, and conduct toward him in all respects as if the wrong had not been committed. We must feel, and show that we feel, that he is as worthy of our confidence and love as before the injury was inflicted.

There are some, who, when the duty of forgiveness is urged upon them, say, "I will forgive, but will not forget." Now if such persons mean only to say, that memory will be faithful to her trust, that the unpleasant occurrences of the past can never be quite forgotten, though not suffered to color their feelings nor affect their conduct toward him who has offended, it is very well. But usually when such a remark is made, more is meant than meets the ear. We understand the man who uses this language to affirm, that the injury shall remain fixed, not only in the memory, but in the heart; that it shall be voluntarily, purposely remembered against its author; brooded over; suffered to rankle in the bosom and embitter

the feelings ; though not allowed to body itself forth in overt acts of retaliation. No argument is necessary to demonstrate the secret vindictiveness, the utter destitution of the spirit of forgiveness, which such language evinces.

The Bible uses synonyms in depicting the pardoning grace of Jehovah. The Divine forgiveness is characterized, e. g., as *the blotting out* of the sinner's offenses. Thus David prays : " Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness : according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. . . . Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities."* The Apostle Peter, uses the same figure : " Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord."† Again, God is spoken of as *remembering no more* the sins of those whom He has pardoned. In describing the blessedness of the latter days, Jehovah says of his people : " They all shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them. . . . for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."‡ The forgiven soul being regarded as without sin, is denominated *righteous*. His sin is put away both in name and in fact. And being restored to a state of innocence by a sovereign act of absolution, the arms of Infinite Love are thrown around him ; he is the object of God's smiles, and is henceforth filled, according to his measure, with all the fullness of God.

Such is the nature of the Divine forgiveness, as presented in the Bible. And our position is, that the forgiveness required of man is the same in kind with the forgiveness of God. It is objected, however, that there is this fundamental difference between the two : when God forgives, He performs a governmental act in the remission of punishment ; whereas man, in exercising forgiveness, acts in his private capacity and remits no punishment. This objection may be met in

* Psalm li, 1, 9.

† Acts iii, 19.

‡ Jer. xxxi, 34.

either of two ways. In the first place, it is conceded that God, as the moral Ruler, does that in delivering from punishment which man does not and can not do. But there is reason to regard the penalty of the violated law as a consequent, rather than a constituent part, of forgiveness: for if it were a necessary element of forgiveness, then man would manifestly be unable to forgive; for to inflict or remit punishment is the prerogative of the Supreme alone. And in that case—as has been already remarked—when the forgiveness of God and the forgiveness of man were spoken of in the Scriptures, they would have been designated by different terms. The Bible, however, uniformly represents forgiveness as one and the same, irrespective of the person who exercises it. The appropriate manifestations of the forgiving spirit in God doubtless differ from the appropriate manifestations of the same spirit in man: but this fact comes far short of proving that there is a fundamental diversity in character between the putting away of sin on the part of God, and the putting away of sin on the part of man. The inward feeling is one thing, and the external display of feeling is another thing; and the manifestations may differ, while the feelings revealed in the manifestations remain in full accord. If God and man agree in regarding him who has done them a wrong as if he were without fault, and if each manifests his deep feelings of complacent regard for the offender in fitting ways, the forgiveness which they respectively exercise is specifically one. Indeed it may well be questioned whether a more perfect identity in kind can be predicated respecting any of the ethical emotions which are common to God and man, or respecting any act performed alike by each, than can properly be predicated of the pardoning grace of God and the forgiving love of man.

Or, *secondly*, admitting that the remission of sin is a constituent element in the Divine forgiveness, it may be affirmed that man also, in forgiving his fellow, remits punishment. Man acts in the character of a subject, and God acts as a sovereign. The demand that the evil-doer receive the due

reward for his deeds, is a demand of the rational nature, and may be made, and is in fact made, by man as well as by God. It follows, therefore, that man is capable of relaxing this demand in view of the satisfaction in full of the claims of justice and does relax it in the act of pardon. It is not true, indeed, that vengeance belongeth to us; nor is it proper for us to say that the remission of penalty is primarily lodged with us, for it is not: but when the Almighty has once pronounced the law satisfied, and justice vindicated, and declares the offender absolved from his guilt, and raised up out of the mire of his unworthiness, we also—if our hearts are right—fall into the same current of feeling, and adopt as our own and repeat the sentence of absolution.

II. When is Forgiveness a duty? If by forgiveness we were to understand the quenching of evil passions in ourselves, and not the absolving of another's crimes, the duty of forgiving those who have injured us would be imperative on us at all times. And this is precisely what they mean who affirm that a forgiving spirit should be cherished and manifested irrespective of the feelings and attitude of the offender. Malice, revenge, are always wrong, no matter how great the provocation. We are always under obligation to love our enemies, and do good to those who do evil to us. But the putting away of vindictive feelings—as we have seen—is no part of forgiveness, though often the precursor of it. The giving up of our own sin in the exercise of penitence, is quite a different thing from the giving up of another's sin in the exercise of forgiveness. The command to love our enemies, is not identical with the command to forgive our enemies. The obligation of charity is always binding. Whether the duty of forgiveness is absolute and constant, or conditional and intermittent, must be determined on independent grounds, and is a matter of distinct revelation.

First of all, let us inquire, What is the principle on which God acts in the pardon of the guilty? Does He forgive all who have sinned, indiscriminately, without any regard to

character, without any requisition of moral fitness for the reception of his grace? The Bible leaves us in no doubt on this point. God exacts penitence as the condition of forgiveness, of those even for whom Christ died. There are multitudes whose transgressions are never forgiven, whose sins are never covered. Against the impenitent the anger of the Great King continually burns. He can not forgive the sins of those who refuse to comply with His terms. Man must break off from his sins before God will blot them out. It is not till he has renounced the works of darkness that Infinite Holiness can find in him any good. God loves those only who are in some proper sense deserving of His love. He could not take complacency in rebellion, and impurity, and guilt, without thereby ceasing to be God.

The question now arises, Is that which is fitting and right in God, wrong in man? There is danger, we admit, of our pressing this argument too far; for the Supreme Being doubtless is at liberty to do many things which we, worms of the dust, the subjects of His government, may not lawfully do. Still, when we see that God sternly withholds His forgiveness from the impenitent, are we not justified in presuming from this fact—without conclusive evidence to the contrary—that it is right for man also to require a profession of penitence from one who has injured him, as the ground of pardon? Is it not safe to imitate God? “Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?”

But not to insist longer just now on this point, let us further ask what is the response of *Reason* to the inquiry, whether we are obligated to forgive the impenitent. To illustrate: My neighbor has violated the confidence which I reposed in him; through my unsuspecting frankness he has obtained materials which he has artfully so woven together as seriously to injure my reputation; he has in a thousand ways proved himself my unscrupulous, unrelenting enemy. Now so long as he makes no confession of his wickedness, but rather persists in his assaults on my reputation, is it my duty to treat him precisely

as I would treat a tried friend? Is this the clear teaching of sober common sense? Would it be safe for me thus to act? Nay, is it incumbent on me by virtue of an imperative dictate of my moral nature, to trust where there is no valid basis of trust, to forgive the sinner even while glorying in his sin?

A Christian father has placed his son under the care of a man in whose qualifications as an instructor he reposes unbounded confidence. After a little he learns that his son is encouraged by his teacher in idleness, and in every form of vice and dissipation. He is becoming the slave of evil habits. His health is giving way. He is rapidly throwing off the restraints of morality and religion, and is evidently on the high road to ruin. Now ought that father's confidence in the instructor of his son to be continued, so long as he makes no confession of wrong, and gives no promise of amendment? Is it his Christian duty, as he hopes for salvation through the pardoning mercy of his God, to forgive the miserable wretch who has done him this measureless wrong, and leave his son under the same damning tutelage as before? Could he thus act in good conscience? Does God lay any such burden on us, his creatures?

To forgive the wrong-doer who expresses no sorrow for his evil deeds, is an eminently unreasonable act. How can confidence be reposed in the man who shows himself the betrayer of confidence? How can we take complacency in him who shocks our sense of right by his stubborn perseverence in crime? We impose on ourselves when we imagine such moral impossibilities to be required of us. It is enough for us to tolerate the existence of a viper, without being compelled to carry it in our bosoms. Impenitence ought to be no less hateful to man than it is to God.

Here then we plant ourselves impreguably on a great principle. Sin is intrinsically hateful; and therefore God hates it. His anger burns against the transgressor, because he loves, and does evil. The Holiness, Justice, and Truth of God, con-

strain Him to hold suspended over the sinner's head the sentence of condemnation. Though the love of God is infinite, He can not release the violator of law from the penalty which he has provoked by his misdeeds, except on the ground of a sufficient satisfaction. And even when an Atonement for sin has been made in the death of Christ, it must be accepted by the sinner in penitence and in faith, before it can avail for his justification. In other words, the Love of God is strictly and always consonant with Justice. It is in all its manifestations a holy Love. Jesus died to save men from sin, no less than from eternal pain. Now it can not well be denied that the same principles of Justice and Holiness which underlie the feelings and conduct of God, should also give coloring and shape to all our feelings and conduct. It is our highest duty to be in vital sympathy with God, and to live for the great ends which lie near His heart.* Hence the Divine command, "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil."† "Abhor that which is evil."‡ And so long as the sinner clings to his sins, and excuses them, and refuses to have them washed away in the blood of Christ, so long he is intrinsically hateful, and therefore is hated of God, and therefore should be the object of our aversion. But when he makes confession of his sin, presuming—as we are bound in Christian charity to presume—that he is sincere, and trusting that as a penitent he is washed from his guilt and pardoned, we also should extend to him our complacent regard. If he has in any way injured us, and makes acknowledgment for his wrong, that simple acknowledgment is enough to assure us that his sin is put away of God, and therefore ought to be no longer remembered by us. True, in himself he is ill-deserving; but in Christ he is without fault. When the Divine Justice is satisfied, the demands of our moral natures may well be satisfied. Believing that God is reconciled with the penitent, we need not shrink from taking him to our hearts. Forgiven of his God, he rightfully claims our forgiveness.

* Ps. cxxxix : 21, 22.

† Ps. xevii, 10.

‡ Romans xii, 9.

If we closely analyze our feelings when we contemplate some stupendous crime which does not specially concern ourselves, we shall find our bosoms swelling with a holy indignation, coupled with an irrepressible sentiment of justice, and a vehement desire that law may have its course in the punishment of the evil-doers. Thus when we read the mournful story of the barbarities inflicted on the Waldensian Christians by the papists of Piedmont, we devoutly adopt as our own the prayer of Milton :

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold ;
Ev'n them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worship'd stocks and stones,
Forget not : in thy book record their groans
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese that roll'd
Mother with infant down the rocks, their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven."

When we think of the "pen" at Andersonville, and of the fiendish cruelties of which it was the scene, our very blood boils in our veins, and all that is manly in our instincts, all that is authoritative in our consciences, all that is Christian in us, bids us lift to Eternal Justice the prayer, "Overlook not this dreadful chapter of crimes, but hold the evil-doers to a strict account, and give unto them according to their desert."

The question now arises, Is sin any the less sin because its destructive effects fall primarily on ourselves? May we be filled with indignation in contemplating a wrong inflicted on another, and if a similar wrong is brought on ourselves, must we wink it out of existence as a wrong, and take complacency in it? Is justice Janus-faced; now stern, legal, unrelenting, and now the dispenser of a mere rose-water sentimentalism? Is conscience mutable in her dictates, bidding us hate one sin, and excuse and forgive another of equally crimson dye?

We appeal to history. We cite the example of good men to whom we can not but defer on a question of casuistry of

such high and solemn import. We point, e. g., to Pres. Edwards, one of the keenest, coolest thinkers, one of the most dispassionate moralists, and one of the ripest Christians that our country has produced. In the course of his ministry at Northampton, he discovered a laxness in life among the members of the church under his care, which he considered fairly traceable to the fact that a large part of the church had been received into membership on the ground of their baptism in infancy, and not as persons already regenerate. This "half-way covenant," as it was called, was denounced by Edwards, who sought to have the church adopt a stricter rule, and receive to her fold only such as gave credible evidence of piety. At once an opposition sprang up, headed by a young lawyer of commanding abilities and of fiery zeal, Major Joseph Hawley. With unyielding firmness, and at the same time with unwearied patience and Christian forbearance, Pres. Edwards pressed his point; but all in vain his efforts. His persecutors triumphed; he was driven from his chosen field of labor, and in sadness of heart, went forth to Stockbridge, where he remained till, just before his death, he was called to assume the Presidency of the College at Princeton.

Several years after his dismissal from Northampton, Major Hawley wrote to him, requesting him to give his judgment respecting Hawley's whole course of conduct during the troubles preceding the rupture of his pastoral relations. Edwards' letter in reply was written about four months before his death. We quote a few paragraphs:

"On the whole, Sir, (as you have asked my opinion,) I think, that that town and church lies under great guilt in the sight of God; and they never more can reasonably expect God's favor and blessing, till they have their eyes opened to be convinced of their great provocation of the Most High, and injuriousness to man, and have their temper greatly altered, till they are deeply humbled, and till they openly and in full terms confess themselves guilty, in the manner in which they are guilty indeed, (and what my opinion of that is, I have in

some measure declared,) and openly humble and take shame to themselves before the world, and particularly confess their faults and seek forgiveness where they have been particularly injurious. Such terms, I am persuaded, the righteous God will hold that people to; and that it will forever be in vain for them to think to go free and escape with impunity in any other way. Palliating and extenuating matters, and daubing themselves over with untempered mortar, and sewing fig-leaves, will be in vain before Him, whose pure and omniscient eye is as a flame of fire. It has often been observed, what a curse persons have lived under and been pursued by, for their ill treatment of their natural parents; but especially may this be expected to follow such abuses offered by a people to one who, in their own esteem, is their spiritual father. Expositors and divines often observe, that abuse of God's messengers has commonly been the last sin of an offending, backsliding people, which has filled up the measure of their sin, and put an end to God's patience with them, and brought on their ruin. And 'tis also commonly observed, that the heads and leaders of such a people have been remarkably distinguished in the fruits of God's vengeance in such cases. And as you, Sir, distinguished yourself as a head and leader to that people in these affairs, at least the main of them, so, I think, the guilt that lies on you in the sight of God is distinguishing, and that you may expect to be distinguished by God's frown, unless there be true repentance, and properly expressed and manifested, with endeavors to be a leader of the people in the affair of repentance, as in their transgression. . . .

"Thus, Sir, I have done the thing which you requested of me. I wish you may accept it in as christian a manner as you asked it. You may possibly think that the plain way in which I have given my judgment, shows that I am far from being impartial, and that I show a disposition to aggravate and enhance things, and set them forth in the blackest colors, and that I plainly manifest ill-will to you. All that I shall

say to this is, that if you think so, I think you are mistaken. And having performed the disagreeable task you desired of me, I must leave you to judge for yourself concerning what I say. I have spoken my judgment with as great a degree of impartiality as I am master of, and that which is my steady and constant judgment of this awful affair, and I doubt not will be my judgment as long as I live.

" With respectful salutations to your spouse, I am, sir, your kinsman and friend, that sincerely wishes your truest and greatest welfare and happiness in this world and the world to come."*

Testimony like this need not be multiplied. The question is, How much value shall we accord to it? Cavillers may insist that men like Pres. Edwards, smarting under a sense of personal wrong, are not the best judges in their own case. They may urge that the human heart is deceitful; that the best of men are liable to be warped by interest and passion; that no Christian in his life is perfectly free from sin; that the motives which actuate good men at their best estate are of a mixed character, being partly good and partly bad; that the conscience is blinded by the fall, and that her decisions need to be tested and corrected by the Word of God. This may all be true, and still the testimony of men like Pres. Edwards, on the question at issue, though they be fallible men, ought to have great weight. It is much that the consciences of the most cautious, the most devout, the most saintly of men, when most carefully interrogated, do give back the response, that forgiveness is not a duty, except on condition of penitence. After all that can be said in weakening the force of this fact, the fact remains, and is worthy of the most profound respect.

We now advance one step further in our argument, and make appeal to holy men acting under the immediate inspira-

* This letter of Pres. Edwards may be found in Bib. Sacra., Vol. I, p. 583, seq.

tion of the Holy Ghost. When Nehemiah was withstood by Sanballat and Tobiah in his attempt to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, he went to his Heavenly Father with the prayer: "Hear, O our God; for we are despised: and turn their reproach upon their own head, and give them for a prey in the land of captivity: and cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thee."^{*}

David often supplicated the aid of Jehovah in similar terms. The following is one instance of many. "Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul: let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt. Let them be as chaff before the wind: and let the angel of the Lord chase them. Let their way be dark and slippery: and let the angel of the Lord persecute them. For without cause have they hid for me their net in a pit, which without cause they have digged for my soul. Let destruction come upon him at unawares; and let his net that he hath hid catch himself: into that very destruction let him fall. And my soul shall be joyful in the Lord: it shall rejoice in his salvation."[†]

When wicked men conspired to take the life of Jeremiah, because of his fidelity in denouncing the impending judgments of God against Judah, he committed himself to the Divine protection in a similar prayer. "Give heed to me, O Lord, and hearken to the voice of them that contend with me. Shall evil be recompensed for good? for they have digged a pit for my soul. Remember that I stood before thee to speak good for them, and to turn away the wrath from them. Therefore deliver up their children to the famine, and pour out their blood by the force of the sword; and let their wives be bereaved of their children, and be widows; and let their men be put to death; let their young men be slain by the sword in battle. Let a cry be heard from their houses, when thou shalt bring a troop suddenly upon them: for they

^{*} Neh. iv, 4, 5.

[†] Ps. xxxv, 4-9.

have digged a pit to take me, and hid snares for my feet. Yet, Lord, thou knowest all their counsel against me to slay me: forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight, but let them be overthrown before thee; deal thus with them in the time of thine anger."*

It will not be pretended that this is the language of forgiveness. Nor is there any evidence that the conduct of these men was disapproved of God, as if they were guilty of a wrong in sternly refusing to put away the sins of their enemies, and in beseeching the Most High not to blot them from His book. For aught we can see, these petitions were just as pure, just as acceptable to the Hearer of prayer, as David's thirst for God, or Nehemiah's penitential confession. These men felt that they had been wantonly, wickedly injured. Their enemies held out in their criminal courses, and refused to make acknowledgment of their guilt. In these circumstances, these God-fearing men—of whom the world was not worthy—looked to the Almighty, and besought that justice might be vindicated. It did not alter the case that the cause of right was wounded in their persons. It was God who was insulted; it was His honor that demanded redress. Their cry was for justice: and when sin is not put away, what is this but a prayer for retribution?

But we hear it asked, Are we not commanded to pray for our enemies, to love them, to bless them, to desire their happiness and salvation? True: but is not prayer for one good as commendable, in its time and place, as prayer for any other good? Is not God just, as well as merciful? Is kindness to ourselves any less holy than kindness to our neighbor? We should pray for them who despitefully use us, that they may be brought to repentance, and saved from the punishment which is their due: but if they refuse to repent, and grow stout in sin, we may earnestly desire that justice may have its own: in some cases it may be right to make this the

* Jeremiah xviii, 19-23.

burden of our prayer. It is our duty to love our enemies; but this by no means involves the duty of desiring that they may be saved dishonorably to God, nor of forgiving them ourselves, except after a suitable acknowledgment of the evil they have committed. How shall we bless whom the Lord hath not blessed? No doubt the predominant feeling in our hearts should be pity, love; but our tenderness should not be suffered to destroy our sense of right. Obstinacy in sin calls for vengeance; and the longing for retribution which sometimes breaks forth irrepressibly, is not necessarily unholy. Love for the transgressor and pleasure in the punishment of his transgression, may coëxist in man as harmoniously as they coëxist in God.

Nor let it be said, in order to weaken the force of these citations from Scripture, that they are made exclusively from the Old Testament, while the New breathes throughout a different and more compassionate spirit. Did not the same sinless Being inspire the entire canon? Are the recorded utterances of patriarchs and prophets, any less revelations of the mind of God than the writings of the Apostles? Is sin any less sinful since, than it was before the incarnation and death of Christ? Are Law, and Justice, and Righteousness any less worthy of respect than they were when Jehovah made known his will in flaming fire on Sinai?

Besides, the same principle of discrimination runs through the entire Scriptures. The New Testament is of kindred tenor with the Old. When Paul and Silas were illegally scourged and imprisoned at Philippi, and the magistrates proposed to set them at liberty in the morning without a trial and an honorable acquittal, Paul indignantly exclaimed, "They have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out."⁷⁶ Paul also wrote to Timothy: "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him accord-

⁷⁶ Acts xvi, 37.

ing to his work.”* Nay, the apostle John informs us that the same unforgiving spirit is cherished by the glorified martyrs to whom imperfection and sin no longer cleave. “I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?”†

Again, we appeal to the example of Christ. We are well aware that many regard this as the weak spot in our argument. The notion has widely obtained, that Christ loved everybody, and of course forgave everybody, and therefore we should do likewise. We are reminded that while on the cross He prayed for His murderers, “Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do;” and we are significantly asked, if the prayer that they might be forgiven, does not demonstrate incontestibly that Jesus forgave them. Let us examine and see.

When our Lord took a whip of small cords and scourged the money-changers out of the temple, the apostle John records that, “his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.”‡ The reference here is to Psalm lxi: 9, the first part of the verse only being quoted. The latter part of the same verse is also applied to Christ by Paul, (Romans xv: 3). In giving the story of the crucifixion, John says: “After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost.”§ Allusion is made here to the same Psalm (lxi: 21). And because of these re-

* 2 Tim. iv, 14.

† Rev. vi, 9, 10.

‡ John ii: 17.

§ John xix, 28-30.

peated references, the 69th Psalm is styled by expositors *Messianic*. Alexander, in his commentary on the Psalms, says, "There is no psalm, except the twenty-second, more distinctly applied to him [*i. e.* to Christ] in the New Testament." In order that we may get a clear idea of the true feelings of Christ in His dying, we quote a few verses from the Psalm, commencing with verse 21st: "They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. Let their table become a snare before them: and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not; and make their loins continually to shake. Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. Let their habitation be desolate; and let none dwell in their tents. For they persecute him whom thou hast smitten; and they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded. Add iniquity unto their iniquity: and let them not come into thy righteousness. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous."

If any inquire whether the whole tenor of Christ's life does not argue the unfairness of ascribing to Him sentiments like these, we ask him to read the withering denunciations of Jesus against these same Jews, uttered only a little before, which are recorded in the 23d chapter of Matthew, and then judge. When He put to them the pointed inquiry, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" and assured them that upon them was about to come all the blood of the prophets whom their fathers had slain, was He in the exercise of a forgiving spirit? Besides, this same Jesus will one day sit in judgment on those who crucified Him. What will then be His language to those that repented not? Will He say, "I forgave you once, but will not now forgive you?" Will He not rather say, "I loved you with an infinite love; I prayed for you; I wept over you; I died to redeem you; but I did not forgive you: Depart from me; I *never* knew you."

Did Christ forgive all His enemies? Then all will be

saved. Did He forgive those only who repented? Then let us imitate His example.

Our final appeal is to the Bible. What saith the Scripture? Sometimes there is no limitation specified, but we are simply required to forgive those who injure us, as we ourselves hope to be forgiven. "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."* Other passages, however, limit the duty, and by them must we interpret those passages which are more general. "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven For with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again."† The measure that will be meted to us is, forgiveness, provided we repent, and not otherwise. And this is the exact measure which we are required to mete to others. Again, our Saviour makes the statement of our duty with all its qualifications, so that there need be no further question. "Take heed to yourselves; If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."‡ To a command so decisive let us bow without dispute.

Before leaving, however, this branch of our discussion, it seems proper to revert again to the practical difficulty under which some minds labor, in reconciling the demand of repentance, prior to the exercise of forgiveness; and as its *conditio sine qua non*, with the exercise of Christian charity. The inquiry is reiterated, "After all, are not the two things utterly incompatible with each other, and must not the one or the other of necessity give way?"

In reply, we inquire if there is not in God the Father an infinite compassion for those whom, on account of their impenitence, He cannot forgive, and against whom His anger burns; if Christ, seated on the throne of judgment, sentencing

* Matthew vi, 14, 15.

† Luke vi, 37, 38.

‡ Luke xvii, 3, 4.

the incorrigibly wicked to everlasting burning, is essentially a different Being from the Lamb of God, dying on the cross; if Justice is not a divine attribute, most glorious, most lovely, even in the act of lifting the sword to slay; if an undying hatred of sin may not coëxist in the same bosom with a Christ-like love of the sinner? Be it so, that the work of maintaining in the soul the love which the Gospel requires while forgiveness is rigorously withheld, is a difficult work; difficult to hate the sin without also hating the sinner; difficult, to prevent feelings of vindictiveness from taking possession of the heart, under the guise of an uncompromising loyalty to justice: still, by the grace of God the difficulty is not insuperable. Our King is continually summoning us to arduous tasks, to heroic achievements. What the ransomed, who are singing the praises of the Lamb on the sea of glass, do not shrink from doing, need not startle us as a thing of questionable morality. What good men here on earth have successfully accomplished, should not seem too hard for us. What our incarnate Lord has done, we may hopefully aspire to do. If our path is beset with dangers, we should be on our guard against them. If we are not of ourselves equal to the duty which is imposed on us, we must look up for needed help. And above all things we must have fervent charity, and not dare offer to God the unhallowed fire of our selfish passions. This is doubtless what Paul meant when he penned the precept, "Be ye angry and sin not." Our path is straight onward, and from it we may not swerve, either to the right hand or to the left.

III. What are the sanctions by which the duty of forgiveness is enforced? Two passages containing these sanctions have been already quoted, (Matt. vi, 14, 15, and Luke vi, 38). He who has no heart to forgive his penitent brother, can not himself hope to be forgiven. If he knew by his own experience what true penitence is, he would not look with such cold unconcern on the penitence of another. Genuine sorrow for sin makes us tender, sympathetic, prompt to encourage

contrition in our neighbor, and swift to forgive. And as we deal with others, God will deal with us. If we forgive, we shall be forgiven; but if we will show no mercy, we need hope for none. Our very prayers for mercy, if according to the mind of Christ, are an acknowledgment of this. "After this manner therefore pray ye. . . . And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."* To hold out unrelenting, when our brother confesses his fault and implores pardon, is to reject the atonement of Christ, and count ourselves impenitent and unworthy of forgiveness. And so it is that as we judge, we shall be judged. This solemn lesson is strikingly illustrated in one of the parables of our Saviour, and nothing can add to its force. "Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king which would take account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him which owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. The servant therefore fell down and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the Lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants, which owed him an hundred pence: and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest. And his fellow-servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt because thou desiredst me: shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was

* Matt. vi, 9, 12.

wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."*

* Matt. xviii, 23-35.

ART. III.—REPORT TO THE EVANGELICAL
ALLIANCE.

BY HENRY B. SMITH, D. D.

Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. City.

The reorganization of the American Branch of the Evangelical Alliance was completed at a meeting held in the City of New York, Jan. 30, 1867. The Honorable William E. Dodge, of New York, was elected President, with a large number of Vice-Presidents and Councillors, representing all the leading evangelical churches, and, so far as practicable, all parts of the country. A copy of our Constitution, with the names of the various officers, is subjoined to this report. At a subsequent meeting, the Executive Committee of the Alliance directed the undersigned to draw up a Report on the State of Religion in our American Churches, and transmit it to the Fifth General Conference of the Alliance to be held in Amsterdam.

We rejoice in the revival of these Christian bonds, by which, we trust, the Protestant Churches of the old and the new world may be more closely linked together. We are glad that the misunderstandings, which, for a time, seemed to separate us, have now spent their force. These were chiefly two: at first, the existence of slavery in this country, which was made a bar to the reception of some of our ministers abroad: and then, by way of contrast, the apparent want of sympathy with our Republic during its recent struggle for our national unity, and for the abolition of slavery. Our national constitution now forbids slavery throughout all our states and territories. And the course and results of our war have demonstrated, what many even good men doubted, that slavery was its chief cause, as the extinction of slavery was its grand result, neces-

sary alike to our national unity and to our future progress and prosperity. For, as even Aristotle long since said: "It belongs to the essence and aim of the State, that citizens by their union should seek to become better and more perfect men in deed and in truth." (Pol. iii, 6.) And this can not be so long as power, in the name of law, tramples on human rights.

The Foreign Secretary of the Holland Branch of the Alliance, in his letter to us, alludes to the ties of union and sympathy between the Netherlands and our Republic. He happily associates our two countries, and two great names, when he says, that you mourned with us in the sad loss of our venerated President Lincoln, "falling as another William of Orange, victim of his virtues, and martyr for a great and noble cause." Yes: these two martyrs, one in a common tragic end, are henceforth conjoined in the memory of mankind, and unite us more closely in love to that immortal cause for which they died! But other ties bind us to your land. You, like ourselves, have been a refuge for the persecuted and oppressed from other lands—a European asylum for liberty of thought and freedom of worship. When John Robinson, two hundred and fifty years ago, fled from Scrooby, he found refuge, first in Amsterdam and then in Leyden; and there, shielded by your hospitality, he taught his emigrant church, until they were ready to embark at Delft Haven, in the *Mayflower*, on their way to found the colony of Plymouth, in Massachusetts, from which has sprung so much of our liberty-loving and God-fearing population. Eleven years before this colony was established (in 1609,) your Hendrik Hudson, in his *Half Moon*, had discovered and named our lordly river, the Hudson. Adrian Block's ship, the *Unrest*, came to New Amsterdam (Manhattan) in 1623; and in 1626, Peter Minuit bought for twenty-six dollars the whole island, which is now called New York. Here, too, under your auspices was planted your Reformed Church, with Domine Jonas Michaelius for its first minister, sent over in 1628; and the Collegiate Church

to which he ministered still survives, orthodox and vigorous, though now speaking another language ; and it sends to the mother country, through our Alliance, its cordial Christian salutations. The memory of your heroic conflicts for the Reformed faith, the inspiration of your sacrifices for religious freedom, and even the very frame-work of your civil institutions, have worked among us for our good, and ally your land with ours. And your States General, first among the European nations, declared the great principle of religious liberty, "that not only ought all religions to be tolerated, but that all restraint in matters of religion was as detestable as the Inquisition itself."

Your Secretary also assures us, and his words demand and receive our grateful recognition, that "Holland has been unanimous on the side of what was felt to be the cause of righteousness and liberty." In the very midst of our struggle, too, when the proud waters had well nigh gone over us, we received similar assurances and encouragement from the French Branch of the Alliance, ever faithful to the cause of freedom. To be with us then called for faith and insight ; for such insight as anticipates the verdict of posterity. We were struggling with a gigantic rebellion : it was a question as to the life or death of this Republic ; it was a question of slavery or liberty for a whole continent. What we needed from abroad was, not material aid, but moral support.

There were two grounds on which we felt justified in expecting such sympathy ; on the ground of constitutional law, and on the ground of human liberty : for we were contending for liberty under the sanction of law. On the other hand, the revolted states stood upon the right of secession, which undermines the possibility of a stable government ; and on the rightfulness of human bondage, which is at war with the primary instincts of humanity, the political well-being of the state, and the essential principles of the Christian religion. On these points the issue was joined and submitted to the dread arbitrament of war. The political form which the con-

test assumed was, primarily and necessarily, that of subduing a rebellion and maintaining the rightful authority of the national government; but the moral forces at work were those of freedom and slavery; and so the victory of the Union was identified with the abolition of slavery. For the first, and we trust, for the last time, in human history, the question of freedom or slavery, as a national question, was made the turning point of a civil war.

The conflict assumed gigantic proportions, for it was a contest of law and of ideas against the strongest and most compact material interest of the country, which had hitherto been paramount in our national councils, representing a slave property valued at about 3,000,000,000 dollars, which was also about the amount of the debt incurred by the nation in carrying on the war. The whole population of the United States in 1860, was 31,443,321. The number of slaves was 3,953,587; of slave-holders 384,884. At the breaking out of the rebellion the whole army of the United States consisted of only 16,404 men. The enlistments during the war, on the national side, rose to 2,688,523—allowing for reënlistments at successive draftings, the number of men enlisted was probably not far short of one and a half millions, of whom 186,917 were negro troops. Eighty per cent. of the enlistments were from our native born population. Of the whole number enlisted in the rebel states there is no official account; the largest number at any one time on their rolls was about 550,000. The whole white male population of the Southern States, between the ages of 18 and 45, was 1,064,193. It would be a large estimate to say that three-quarters of these (750,000) were enlisted during the war. This would make the whole number of men enlisted, North and South, about two and a quarter millions (though the current popular estimate is much greater, but probably incorrect). The navy of the United States rose to 684 ships of war, with 4,477 guns, and 51,000 officers and men. The whole number of battles and minor engagements was about 225. In these

battles, the official record of losses in the army of the United States, as given by the Provost Marshal, James B. Fry, makes a total of 280,739 officers and men, of whom 96,606 were killed or died of wounds, and the remainder were the victims of diseases incident to war. This is doubtless a low estimate. The loss on the rebel side must have been nearly as great. The number, still living, but maimed or diseased through the war, can only be conjectured. Calling these 150,000, the whole number, on both sides, who were the victims to this rebellion, cannot be less than 750,000 or 800,000 men,*—not to speak of the wasting grief and agony of half a million bereaved households. At the close of the war, the United States had in the field over a million of men; and in six months afterwards it had disbanded a million, who went peaceably back to the occupations which they had left for a time to save their land. The other burdens which remained have been cheerfully borne. The debt of the United States, on June 1st, 1867, is left at \$2,515,615,936; the revenue for the past year was over \$540,000,000, 209,000,000 of which went to the extinction of the principal of the debt. Besides this national indebtedness, the state debts for war purposes amount to 500,000,000 more: the loyal states paid in bounty money to volunteers \$284,805,400, in addition to the three hundred millions paid by the United States for the same object. The pecuniary losses in the Southern States can hardly be estimated; in addition to the amount of some three thousand millions for what was called slave property, the other pecuniary losses can not be less than two thousand millions, and these losses are total. But the debt of the United States is a sacred trust, held all over the land. Next to the patriotic self-sacrifice shown in the marvellous levying of

* Many accounts of this War represent it as almost unparalleled in carnage. But this is far from being the case. The yearly average of losses was certainly not greater than in the European wars from 1792 to 1815; not larger than the yearly average in the Crimean Campaign, in which the losses are put down at over half a million.

our hosts of war, was equally the patriotic zeal shown in placing the wealth of the land at the disposal of the government. For now, more than ever, is money one of the chief sinews of war.

Thus have we purchased at a great price our national unity, and the boon of freedom for the oppressed. Such a sacrifice of blood and treasure is defensible, only as the object is worthy of the cost. God's Providence laid the burden upon us, and that same Providence is permitting us already to see, that they who sow in tears shall reap in joy. We were called upon to sacrifice what was best and dearest to us for the sake of the Republic, for the sake of humanity; the higher race was called upon to lay its costliest gifts upon the altar for the sake of the lowly and oppressed, for whom our Heavenly Father cares; and in such sacrifice, which is a part of the inmost and vital law of Christianity itself, we have learned lessons which have rebuked our pride and vainglory, checked our inordinate pursuit of material well-being, fostered our sympathy for the down-trodden, deepened our sense of the reality of a divine government and of the justice of retribution for our national sins, and taught us more clearly what our beloved country was meant to be and do among the nations of the earth. Accepting this war, fully and humbly, as a retribution for our national sins, foremost among which is the guilt of slavery, we find in its results, as in all the Divine dealings, justice tempered by mercy, and the good hand of our God, causing the wrath of man to redound to His praise and to promote the welfare of the kingdom of his Son. For through all the stages of this contest, even in its most disastrous days, the Christian people of this Republic were animated and upheld by the profound conviction, that they were not living unto themselves; that they were contending for a cause of unspeakable moment to the welfare and progress of mankind; and that the success of our nation would help on the victory of human rights and freedom all over the earth. And this terrible Civil War has been so overruled by a wonder-work-

ing Providence, that these States are now one nation as never before; that the one great overshadowing evil of our political and social system has been done away; that new fountains of charity have been opened; and that new life and vigor have been infused into our religious, educational and philanthropic institutions, laboring for the welfare and progress of mankind.

Our National Unity has been preserved and secured. It was not a war for aggrandizement, but for self-preservation; and even those who condemn the former might approve the latter. It was a war, not for territory, but for a Republic; to decide the question whether a republican government was really safe and strong, as able to overthrow a rebellion as to repel a foreign foe. In and by the war the nation came to its self-conscious majority, to the full sense of a common and indestructible national life. Its resources had been quietly accumulating, and the fullness of its strength was never known until its very life was at stake. Then the latent forces were disengaged, as by the magician's touch, and shaped themselves into order, and made the nation for four years a vast organized host. And this was not the doing of the government, it was rather the instinct of the people.

This unity is mutely foretold in our very geography. The great German geographer, Karl Ritter, says, that the very "configuration of this country allows civilization to penetrate without obstruction every portion of the land;" and adds, "that the past ages have given man the means of gaining the victory over nature; the New World, now in its infancy, is to apply these means." Sagacious rulers and statesmen bear witness to the same fact. Louis Napoleon, before he assumed the empire, in his *Idées Napoléoniennes* (1848,) said of us: "Providence has entrusted to the United States of America the care of peopling and acquiring to civilization all that immense territory that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the North Pole to the Equator." This prophetic hint surpasses even our Western ambition, for it

includes the new Dominion of Canada and the late Empire of Mexico. But within our rightful boundaries, it was essential that our unity should be maintained, because thus alone could our Republic fulfill its destiny; thus alone could the thronging population from other lands be fused into one people; thus alone could a free, Protestant Christianity have full opportunity for its development and application; thus alone could European powers be kept from a continual revival of projects for the colonization and subjugation of this Western world; and thus alone could we prevent the establishment of a republic, with the rightfulness of slavery for the corner stone of its policy, in the very heart of this continent, and in the middle of the nineteenth century of the Christian religion.*

And we were enabled to vindicate our national authority without running into either of the opposite perils of anarchy or despotism. The republic was securely poised between these two, and hence its power. The fears of our enemies and the hopes of our friends were equally fulfilled. The majesty of law was made supreme. While the safety of the Republic was the supreme law of the exigency, yet the public and written law was observed, and the right of self-government was also made a duty. No fear of military despotism ever disturbed us. The army, after the war, subsided as peacefully as the waves of the sea after a storm. And we may here quote the noble eulogy of an eloquent French statesman, Count de Montalembert, whose sympathies, like so many others of the best of his nation, were with us, because he is a lover of justice and freedom, and who impartially testifies (in his *Victory of the North of the United States*), that "this civil war might have made of the American democracy a Cæsarean and military democracy; but the contrary has

* The fact that the South was contending for slavery could not be denied even by those who protested that the General Government was not fighting for liberty: and this fact, chiefly, prevented the recognition of the Confederate States by foreign nations. Only one European ruler (the one who, as Dante says, "mixes two government, that ill assort"), the Pope of Rome, sent words of sympathy to President Davis.

occurred. It is still a liberal and Christian democracy. It is the first great fact, which, in the annals of modern democracy, without reservation, strengthens and consoles ; the first which is worthy to inspire confidence in its future ; limited confidence, humble and modest, as all human confidence should be ; but an intrepid and severe self-reliance, as that of free hearts and honest consciences ought to be. America has just shown, for the first time since the beginning of the world, that liberty can coëxist in a democracy with war, and moreover with an extent of country almost unequalled."

The triumph of National Unity has also secured the Abolition of Slavery. By the sure logic of history, as the slave power culminated in secession, and secession in rebellion, so the national instinct culminated in the vindication of the national supremacy, and that supremacy, established by victory, buried secession and slavery in a common grave. Peace meant abolition. The war was made strong by an idea ; and that idea was a moral principle. We fought for national unity, not for its own sake alone—though that were as defensible, to say the least, as any modern European war ; not even for the sake of empire, though that has been the moving cause and reason of the most bloody contests of history ; but also because we believed and knew that the preservation of the national unity was essential to the progress of freedom. Slavery was the one great hindrance to the realization of the essential idea of our Republic, and the success of the Republic was the doom of slavery. Secession gave us the legal right of abolishing slavery in all the revolted states. When, by force of arms, we prevented the establishment of a slave republic within our borders, we also acquired the right, as a war measure, of extending the bounds of freedom. Such was the logic of war ; it made the impossible possible. In giving us unity and peace, it also gave us liberty through all our borders. President Lincoln, though he had said, "I am naturally anti-slavery ; if slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong," hesitated, as President, on constitutional grounds, to

issue the Proclamation of Emancipation, until it became plainly necessary. By that proclamation, on Jan. 1st, 1862, 3,405,015 slaves were emancipated. An amendment to the Constitution, declared on Dec. 18th, 1865, by the Secretary of State, to be duly ratified, provides, that "neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." The civil rights of the emancipated have been duly protected by subsequent legislation. And in the plan of reconstruction, now in progress under the restraints of a temporary military guardianship, it is expressly provided that none are to be excluded from ballot on account of their color. Practically, the choice was between arming the negro with the ballot, or keeping a standing army at the South to secure the civil rights of freedmen. On the 31st of June last, in Washington itself, negro suffrage was carried into effect, without disturbance. The work of the registration of the whole Southern population is now going on; and when that is consummated, and these States are all restored to their harmonious relations with the General Government, we shall witness the unexampled and sublime spectacle of a whole race, long oppressed, elevated at once to the full rights of freemen. The one great anomaly will then be eliminated from our political system. It will be the victory, not only of the nation, but of humanity itself, and of Christian civilization. Under God's blessing we may then, a purified and regenerated nation, reap the fruit of our costly sacrifices. God has saved us from ourselves. He has not destroyed us, because we trusted in Him, and cared for those for whom He cares. In the hour of our victory He also quelled in us the spirit of revenge. He has led us forth with a high hand and an outstretched arm, and, in giving us new trust in Him, has also given us new confidence in the power and perpetuity of our Republic, founded in the doctrine of human rights, and thus adapted to promote and speed human welfare :

"Vital in every part,
"It can but by annihilating die."

Our most solemn national trust has respect to that down-trodden, yet patient, African race, so long held in cruel bondage. We neither ignore, nor deny, the magnitude and the difficulty of the new problem in human history, with which we are now brought face to face. Can an inferior and long oppressed race, be thus suddenly brought to a condition of civil and political equality, without endangering the social fabric? This is an untried question. It is the one we must meet and solve. In this dim and perilous way, our light must come from faith rather than from experience: but this is also the condition of all civil and moral progress, for progress implies trust in the future rather than in the past. The prime necessity in respect to the four millions of negroes, thus suddenly invested with new rights and duties, is that they be educated into complete fitness for their new position. And this work must be speedily accomplished. For the immediate exigency, the national Government has made some provision, in an exceptional way, by establishing the Freedmen's Bureau, under the intelligent and able management of Major-General O. O. Howard. This Bureau protects the freedmen in their civil rights; gives rations to the needy, both white and black; and has a certain supervision over the schools for the negroes. It expended last year over four millions of dollars, issuing some thirteen and a half millions of rations, and giving hospital treatment to 170,000 persons. For the present year, the estimate of extra rations, in consequence of the failure of crops, is over two millions. The last Report of this Bureau (June) in respect to Freedmen's Schools, at the South, gives the number of teachers as 1,744, and of pupils 95,987. Of the 1,200 schools reported at the beginning of the year, 333 were already self-supporting, and 290 were partially supported by the freedmen; of the teachers, 453 were colored and 972 white. There were also 17 Industrial Schools with 1,279 pupils; 575 Sunday Schools, with 52,409 pupils; and 11 Normal Schools (for teachers) with 581 pupils. The funds for the support of these schools come from private

charity. Two large associations are especially engaged in this work: the American Missionary Association, and the American Freedman's Union Commission. The receipts of the Association last year were \$253,000; it has 508 missionaries and teachers among the freedmen; scholars 38,719; in Sabbath Schools 18,010. This Association imparts religious as well as secular instruction. The American Freedman's Commission, of which Chief Justice Chase is the President, was formed by a union of various societies, and it has some three thousand branches and auxiliaries in this country, and in France, Switzerland, Germany and England. It has established 301 schools, taught by 773 teachers and having 40,744 pupils; last year it distributed supplies to the amount of half a million of dollars; its money receipts were \$280,768. The whole number of freedmen, who have learned to read and write, during the past two years, can not be less than 200,000; the whole number of teachers is about 2,000. This is a great advance; but there are probably no less than a million who need instruction. Other societies,* besides those named, are laboring in the same work; most of the religious denominations have made some special provision for this object, the whole amount of which can only be conjectured. The interest of Mr. Peabody's noble fund, of more than a million of dollars, also aids in part in the same work. The call for increased effort is urgent, for the need is vital. The Southern States have never been able to carry out any general system of public instruction, so that the work has to be done from the very foundation. And it now seems probable that the whole South will at last obtain the blessing of general education indirectly through the freedmen themselves. The progress of the pupils in these schools is eminently gratifying. Many of them have had some of the very best and most self-denying teachers in the land, who have

* The African Civilization Society is an association of colored persons in New York, acting on the principle that the blacks can best train the blacks. It has 19 schools, 32 teachers, and 1,367 scholars in Md., Va., etc.

gone to them from the North with a truly missionary spirit. As to the desire and the capacity of the negro for education, there can be no reasonable doubt.* The training of the coming generation will produce decisive results. Several colleges are already started for giving still higher instruction. The Lincoln University (at Oxford, Pa.) has just been endowed with four professorships (by W. E. Dodge, J. C. Baldwin and others), and had 90 students the past year, a large part of whom will go into the sacred ministry. Arrangements are making for the training of colored preachers in the different denominations at the South; and the conviction of the Southern people, in most of the churches, is rapidly tending to the conclusion (still resisted by some,) that color should not be a bar to the sacred office. There will soon be rivalry among the different churches for receiving this race to their respective folds.† Black men already act on juries throughout the South. And Southern politicians are already showing eagerness to gain the negro vote. Competition may confer the boon which selfishness might withhold. These social, political, religious and educational influences are at work upon this great problem. And it is our firm trust, that the same Divine Providence which broke the fetters of the slaves, will exalt them to the dignity of freemen; and that the freedom of the Gospel will purify and confirm all their other rights. There need be no fear of a Christianized negro population.

In such a juncture and crisis of the national life, as that

* One freedwoman, Nashville, Tenn., Frances E. W. Harper, is noted for her poetic gifts; she recently published a little poem, in which she writes of Freedom, that

"White robed and pure her feet shall move,
O'er rifts of ruin deep and wide,
Her hands shall span with lasting love
The chasms rent by hate and pride."

† In 1860 there were reported 468,000 colored church members at the South: Methodists, 215,000; Baptists, 175,000; Presbyterians, 18,000; Cumberland Presbyterians, 20,000; Campbellite Baptists, 10,000; Episcopal, 7,000; all others about 20,000. The whole number of persons of African descent in the Western hemisphere is about 14,000,000.

through which we have been passing in this decisive olympiad of our history, all the great powers of society are aroused to their full activity, for all its interests, political, social, moral and religious are at stake. Not only was the State imperilled, but also the Church. Not only were our republican institutions tested, but also our American Christianity. The question here was, whether the special form which Christianity has put on in the growth of our Republic would be able to meet the shock and stress of civil war, and come out strong and triumphant? Could the Church meet the emergency as well as the State? This question was not on the surface of the conflict, but it was at work in the very heart of our life. And, in general, we may say, with devout thanksgiving to the Great Head of the Church, that He has led us, and cared for us, and bound anew the chaplet of victory upon the brow of his contesting bride. Our American Christianity, with whatever there is distinctive in it, has not become disintegrated, nor has it succumbed; but it has rather been an effectual aid to the State in the saving of the land; it has held up full high advanced the great moral issues of the strife; it has helped to swell, beyond all previous measure, the sum and volume of philanthropic labors and contributions for the relief of the sick, the suffering and the dying: while at the same time it has largely increased its collections for its own special objects, strengthened and compacted its organizations, remained steadfast in its faith and order, and is left, at the close of the war, more strong for its vast future work, and making larger preparations for that work, than ever before. And in all this we recognize and adore the good hand of our God upon us. The War of the Revolution left the churches, eighty years back, enfeebled and distracted, for they were then entering upon the untried career of separation from the state. Our distinctive American Christianity has been built up on the basis of that separation, and now, after a sterner trial than ever before, we are more than ever convinced, that for the churches of our land this is the way of safety and of

growth. There was here no precedent and no analogy. Those accustomed to the compact, external unity of a state-church might easily hope or fear, that our many external divisions were signs of internal weakness, and that we should be disintegrated by the violence of the civil commotion and strife. Of this fear we were not ourselves conscious; and the progress of events has shown that the ecclesiastical tendencies, in the midst of our civil strife, have looked in the direction of reünion rather than of increased subdivisions.

The special and determining characteristic of our American Christianity, growing out of the very necessities of our history, is found in the separation of Church and State—which separation, in its last grounds, rests, on the one hand, upon the principle of religious liberty, and, on the other, upon a confidence in the self-sustaining power of Christianity itself.* We believe that no external power, be it ecclesiastical or secular, has a right to invade the sacred province of religious freedom. We also believe that Christianity does not need the support of the State. As faith in human rights is at the basis of our republican institutions, so, and with still stronger emphasis, is faith in Christianity at the basis of our religious growth and order: we are willing to trust its inherent truth and power against all the assaults of its foes, against an infidelity born of passion or an infidelity born of speculation, being well assured that the State can not repel these, if the Church can not. Such religious liberty is necessary to true civil freedom; the latter has ever followed the former: where there is no religious, there can not be a fully developed civil freedom; and where religious and civil liberty are fully and equally recognized, there will also ensue a separation of Church and State. Not that we claim to have fully solved the vast problem of the relation of the Church to the

* On this and kindred points, I may refer to Dr. Baird's well-known work on *Religion in America*, prepared for the Evangelical Alliance; and also, particularly, to Dr. Philip Schaff's Report to the Alliance in Berlin, and to his work on *America*, published in 1857.

State ; but we allow all the elements of the solution free and full course, in this transition stage of human history ; confident that we are approaching the solution nearer than is possible where either of the elements is unduly restrained. It is an unsolved problem, the greatest problem of history ; and we are trying to work it out in the sphere of freedom—freedom both in Church and State ; and this is, at least, as reasonable as to try and work it out by means of external fetters and restraints. Our separation of Church and State may be provisional ; but is their union any less so ? Our apparent confusion of sects is, in one aspect, a sign of the fullness of a growing life ; as it is also, in another aspect, an indication that we are at work on a problem not yet fully solved and reduced to scientific order. But the science will follow the experience. Both in Church and State, we have great questions and trials before us ; but we are beyond the complications which come from that union of the ecclesiastical with the secular power, which underlies so many other questions of modern history, and

“ twilight sheds
On half the nation, and with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs.”

And the separation itself may be well, and needful, to bring about that better time, which we can now only dimly imagine, when the two shall be really one, because animated by the same spirit—when the State shall be penetrated in all its laws and acts by the vital principles of the Christian system.

This separation does not imply indifference, still less, opposition. Legally it means simply the non-recognition of any form of Christianity as established by the State. But the State still guarantees to all our churches their legal rights. The General Government also recognizes the Christian religion in various ways ; it administers oaths of office ; it honors the Christian Sabbath ; both Houses of Congress are daily opened with prayer ; it appoints chaplains for the army and navy—500 were under appointment, at one time, during

the late war ; President Lincoln issued an army order for the observance of the Sabbath, and he repeatedly appointed days of fasting, and supplication and thanksgiving, which were solemnly observed by all our churches. A movement is now on foot to procure a more express recognition of the Christian religion in our Constitution. The individual States, too, aid in various ways institutions and objects, not only of a benevolent, but also of a specific Christian character. And as society is more and more penetrated by the Christian system, the laws and institutions of the State will come into more entire accord with the fundamental principles of the kingdom of God.

This separation of Church and State, has left the Church entire freedom in doing a work, which could not otherwise so well be done—which in this land could not have been done at all, if this union had been continued. That work was and is the direct personal application of Christianity to a rapidly increasing population, doubling itself with each generation ; largely fed by immigration, in some years to the extent of 750 per day ; of the most diverse origin and beliefs ; spread over a wide territory, advancing westward on this continent at the rate of twenty-five or thirty miles a year ; and filled with the instinct of freedom, and thus especially impatient of restraint, above all in their religious concerns. Working in the midst of such a population, the Church must use all possible instrumentalities and develope all its resources. It must reach men as individuals, and follow them in their wanderings. And not only must it strive to renew the individual, but also to bring the habits and institutions of social life and order under the influence of the Christian faith. For the real work of Christianity is, and can be, achieved only as it reforms society. Our very freedom allows us to apply Christianity directly to the individual and to society ; it compels us to do this. And in the doing this by means of the rivalry and progress of the different denominations—no one of which can fairly set up any exclusive claims—we find

the most prominent external characteristic of our American Christianity.

The time-honored European lines and divisions of the Christian Church are no longer applicable here; we can not bring the facts of our Christian life under the rubrics of Lutheran and Reformed, and call all the rest, "sects;" nor can we speak of "dissenters" in any proper sense. The "sects" of the Old World are the leading churches of the New World. Most of our sects came to us from Europe, to get rid of state coercion; and they have here had free scope. Our Christian history is not that of the conversion of a new and civilized nation to the Gospel; but of the transplanting of the Christianity of Europe, freed from its local restrictions, to a new theatre; it is Europe itself developed on a new continent. Our leading denominations still stand on the substantial basis of the confessions of the Protestant Reformation, many of them adhering to the old symbols with a tenacity which is now rare in the lands from which they came. Notwithstanding the diversities of name and external order, we are agreed on the main articles of our common evangelical Christianity; and the sense of this unity is increasingly felt. At least three-fourths of our entire population are under the dominant influence of the chief Protestant churches—the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the Methodists and Baptists, the Episcopalian, the Lutheran, the German and Dutch Reformed—to name no other. And as a simple matter of fact, the largest development and increase of Christianity in the nineteenth century has been found in the United States. The Methodists have increased in communicants from 15,000 to about 2,000,000; the Baptists from 35,000 to about 1,700,000; the Presbyterians from 40,000 to 700,000; the Congregationalists from 75,000 to 275,000; the Lutherans number over 300,000 and the German Reformed more than 100,000. And each of these churches reaches a population about four times as large as the number of its church-members.

That the voluntary principle, which is the necessary logical result of the separation of Church and State, is favorable to our progress, appears from the following statistics. According to the United States Census for 1860, there were then 54,000 church edifices in the country, erected wholly by voluntary contributions, at an estimated value of \$171,390,432; and the number of these churches had increased 50 per cent, and their value had doubled, in the previous ten years. There was an average of one church to 544 persons. The total church accommodation was 12,875,119, or about one sitting to every two and a half of the total population. (Of these edifices the Methodists had 19,883, at an average value of 2,000 dollars; the Baptists, 11,211, of the value of 1,700 dollars each; the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, 8,953, of the value of 5,500 dollars, etc.)* The increase in church membership has outrun, in spite of the influx of foreign population, the relative increase of the population. In 1800, the total population was 5,305,935, and the number of church members was 350,000; in 1832, the population was 13,614,420, church-members 1,348,948; in 1860, the population was 31,429,801, church-members, 5,035,250. That is, the ratio in 1800, was one communicant to about fifteen of the population; in 1832, it was one to ten; in 1860, one to six. While

* The number of churches and church accommodations for all denominations in 1860 was as follows: 1. Methodist, 19,883 churches, with accommodations for 6,259,800; 2. Baptist, 12,150, for 4,044,218; 3. Presbyterian, 6,406, for 2,565,949; 4. Roman Catholic, 2,550, for 1,404,437; 5. Congregational, 2,234, for 956,351; 6. Episcopal, 2,145, for 847,296; 7. Lutheran, 2,128, for 757,637; 8. Christian (Baptist), 2,068, for 681,016; 9. Friends, 726, for 269,084; 10. German Reformed, 676, for 273,697; 11. Universalist, 664, for 235,219; 12. Dutch Reformed, 440, for 211,068; 13. Unitarian, 264, for 138,213; 14. Jewish, 77, for 34,412; 15. Adventist, 70, for 17,120; 16. Swedenborgian, 58, for 15,395; 17. Moravian, 49, for 20,316; 18. Spiritualists, 17, for 6,275; 19. Shakers, 12, for 5,200; 20. Union Churches, 1,366, for 371,899; 21. Other Sects, 26, for 14,150. The total is 54,000 churches, with accommodations for 19,128,751; in 1850, ten years before, there were 38,061 churches, with accommodations for 14,234,825. The total value of church property was \$87,328,801, in 1850, and \$171,398,532, in 1860, or nearly double.

the population increased six-fold the church membership increased more than fourteen-fold. And this, too, notwithstanding the fact that during the last period, (from 1832 to 1860,) the number of aliens arriving at our ports was over five millions; and Texas, New Mexico and California were added to our territory. The proportional increase, since 1860, has probably been greater, for the immigration has been much less. This estimate does not include the Roman Catholics, who may number three and a half millions. A larger proportionate increase is also found in our benevolent and missionary contributions; as will be more fully stated in another part of this Report.

This general working of our ecclesiastical principles and institutions was not retarded, but rather invigorated and accelerated, during the period of our great Civil War. In such a crisis the deepest instincts and needs of the soul struggle for expression; and the real elements of national strength and character show themselves—all its higher as well as its lower powers and passions, each struggling for supremacy. Especially will this be the case, where it is a struggle of a lower against a higher form of civilization, of a material interest against a moral idea, of a strong yet unrighteous institution of the past against the higher forces that are to sway the future.

And so this war called out and deepened our general religious needs and convictions, and our sense of the reality of Divine Providence. It quickened the sense of the inviolability of the divine law, of the justice of retribution for national guilt. It made the general conscience more quick to discern between right and wrong, more ready to succor the oppressed and help them to their rights. It made the heart quick to feel, and the hand strong to aid the sick, the wounded and the dying, on innumerable fields of battle; so that while sons and brothers fought and bled, another army of mothers and sisters, all over the land, ministered to their wants with loving and sleepless vigilance. Every town had its society,

and every family its appointed hours, for these deeds of mercy. Ministers from all our churches left their parishes, and met on the battle-field, offering the same prayers, and pointing the suffering and dying to the same Saviour. More than a hundred millions in money are known to have been given by private benevolence for the relief of our soldiers; and who can estimate the innumerable gifts that were never told, or the costly love which itself is priceless? A superficial view might ascribe all this development of justice and humanity to man's moral nature alone, without respect to religion, or to Christianity; but where have such results been seen, except under the fostering and benign influence of the Christian faith? The victories of right over wrong, of humanity over barbarism, of freedom over slavery, of law over anarchy and rebellion—especially when won by self-sacrifice—all progress in human rights and welfare, all advance of liberty under law—these are not foreign to the Christian faith, but born of its inmost spirit; they are signs and indexes of the real progress and triumphs of the Christian religion. In the political and social sphere, the growth of Christianity is indicated by the growth of justice and love; the triumphs of civilization over barbarism, of social justice over social wrong, the elevation of the masses to their rights and their duties—these are proofs of the progress, and auguries of the final supremacy and success of that Christian faith, which was heralded by the annunciation of peace on earth and good-will towards men. It is vain and idle to put morality into opposition to Christianity; for Christian faith worketh by love, and so overcometh the world. It is a reproach to Christianity to say, that it is, or can be, most prosperous, where human rights and man's freedom are unknown or disregarded.

Among the voluntary, charitable organizations called into being by the war, two assumed such large proportions as to call for special recognition: The United States Sanitary Com-

mission, and the Christian Commission.* The Sanitary Commission, Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York, President, was organized for the relief of the sick and wounded, especially at times of great exigency. It had branches, and indefatigable workers, through all the Northern States. Its total receipts were over \$15,000,000 in stores, \$5,000,000 in money, besides over \$1,000,000 expended at local offices. During a large part of the war, it had 400 men in constant employment on the field, and in 40 hospitals under its care. Besides medical aid and treatment, it gave two and a half millions of meals to stray soldiers; it kept records in its books in respect to a million and seven hundred thousand soldiers; it collected some fifty thousand soldiers' claims, amounting to over two millions of dollars. All this was effected by the spontaneous contributions and efforts of the people; and was supplementary to the large and even generous provisions of the Government for the comfort and healing of the sick and wounded. The general sanitary result of these measures is seen in the fact, that, while in the European campaigns of this century the proportion of deaths by disease to the deaths from wounds is as four to one, in our campaign it was reduced one half, two to one—a net saving of some 200,000 lives.

The United States Christian Commission, George H. Stuart, Esq., of Philadelphia, President, was organized Nov. 15, 1861, and continued its work till Jan., 1866; its object was to provide for the spiritual as well as the temporal wants of the soldiers. Its total receipts in money and other donations amounted to \$6,264,607; its commissioned delegates numbered in all 4,859; it distributed \$3,700,000 in stores, over a million of dollars worth of publications, including over a half million of Bibles and Testaments, and a large number of books, news-

* See the four Reports of the latter; and the Bulletins, (3 vols.,) and Reports of the former, with its History, by Stille. The Sanitary Commission has in preparation several other volumes, illustrating the philanthropic, the medical and the sanitary history of the war.

papers, magazines, etc. Through its active delegates, the Gospel was preached in all our armies, and its consolations administered to the sick and dying. And all this service was in addition to that of the regular chaplains.

Besides these larger organizations, there were Ladies' Associations, Soldiers' Aid Societies, Soldiers' Homes and Rests, Volunteer Refreshment Rooms for Soldiers, scattered all over the land. In one such room in Philadelphia, 317,000 meals were provided for soldiers in transit; in another in New York, over 200,000. Voluntary contributions at several hospitals amounted to over two millions of dollars. One lady in a Western town raised \$20,000 in money and \$300,000 in supplies. Wherever battles were fought, the U. S. Commissions, and hundreds of volunteers, including often the best surgeons from our large cities, flocked to the field. Zealous evangelists and preachers of the Gospels, and colporteurs without number, labored constantly in the armies both North and South; and in many a camp, and many a chapel, souls were born again, sometimes in large numbers, into the kingdom of God. There were revivals of religion in tents and by the wayside. Many a soldier in battle saw, as one of them said, "the figure of Christ in the sky." And thus the horrors of war were mantled over by the veil of Christian charity. Fountains of charity and of Christian activity were opened which have not yet ceased to flow.

This heightened Christian benevolence also assumed, and in the very midst of the war, another and an almost unexpected form, which is full of the best promise for the future; and that is, in the voluntary contributions made, on a larger scale than ever before, for our higher institutions of learning. And thus the benevolence showed itself to be not merely sympathetic, but far seeing—not only a sentiment, but also a principle. Our General Government has but little to do directly with the cause of education; though it has recently established a Bureau for the collection of facts, and three years since made the offer of liberal aid in lands to all the States that should

establish agricultural schools. The States, individually, make laws and appropriations for public education; and, at first, they established and aided universities, colleges and other seminaries of learning. But these higher institutions came for the most part under religious or ecclesiastical control, and the consequence has been, from the rivalry of the churches, that of late years their support has been chiefly dependent, as is that of the churches, upon voluntary contributions and donations. This change entails far-reaching results. It seems to leave our higher instruction dependent upon fluctuating influences. And it might well have been feared, that when the country was absorbed in a vast war, laying strong hands on all its resources, the more remote interests of education, (which is essentially a provision for future needs and well being,) would, at least for a time, be neglected. But the contrary has been the fact. Never have our spontaneous offerings for higher education been as large, never have they increased in such proportion, as during the years in which we were struggling for national existence. And this is another evidence of the safety of the voluntary principle among a people trained thereto. The total amount thus given during the past four years, can not be less than seven or eight millions of dollars.* Among the amounts given are over \$450,000 to Yale College, Conn., (one donation being of \$150,000, one of \$80,000, one of \$50,000, etc.,) and over \$100,000 to the Yale Theological School; Amherst College, Mass., \$250,000 in one sum, and Tufts College, in the same state, \$400,000; Harvard College, \$250,000; Brown University, \$160,000; Princeton College, \$160,000, and Princeton Theol. Seminary, \$130,000; Rutgers College, \$140,000; N. Y. Univ., \$160,000; Union Theol. Seminary, New York, \$150,000; Madison University, N. Y., \$160,000; Chicago University, \$200,000; Philadelphia Divin-

* A summary of donations to collegiate and theological institutions, alone, is given by Dr. Baldwin, in his 21st, 22d and 23rd Reports of the Society for Promoting Collegiate Education at the West. He makes the total to Nov., 1866, to be over \$6,500,000; there has been quite an increase since.

ity School, \$200,000; Waterville, Me., \$150,000; Marietta, O., \$100,000, etc. Mr. Cornell, of Ithaca, N. Y., has given \$500,000 for a college, in addition to \$100,000 for a public library; Judge Parker, of Bethlehem, Pa., has founded a college there with the same amount; Mr. Vassar, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., has also given half a million to a Female College; Mr. Crozer has founded a Baptist Theol. School in Penn., with \$270,000; Mr. Drew, a Methodist of New York, has given over half a million to education, the largest part of which is for a Theological School. A college in Constantinople, and one in Beirût, Syria, have been established by New York merchants, at about \$100,000 for each. Mr. George Peabody, now of London, has given over three millions of dollars to various colleges and literary institutions, besides the million he recently funded for educational institutions at the South. The Lutheran Church has raised about \$300,000 for its institutions during the past three years; the German Reformed over \$100,000. The Methodist Centenary Collection amounts to more than three or four millions of dollars, a large proportion of which will be devoted to education. It is becoming more and more the custom of our rich men to bestow their gifts while living, so that they may see and enjoy the results of their benefactions. This increase of private donations to our higher public institutions, in our time of trouble, seems to indicate yet better possibilities in times of peace. And, in fact, hardly a week now, passes without a good report of something done in this way.

Meanwhile, the public school system in the several States also exhibits tokens of prosperity and increase. A republic lives only in the intelligence and virtue of its citizens. It can not prosper where the bulk of the people is ignorant, vicious and lawless. The education of all its youth is a primary condition of its well being and perpetuity. Education is but a name for the process by which each generation trains its successors to take its place, imparting to them, in an increased measure, what it has received from the past, and

itself accumulated, of knowledge and virtue and religion, that thus the safety of the future may be insured. It is a vital process : it hands down the life, intellectual and moral, of the present to shape the coming times. It is the most sacred trust and debt which each generation owes to its successor ; and no generation has played well its part, that does not give a richer legacy to its posterity than it received from its ancestry. The individual man is immortal, because he can be educated, and because the possibilities of his increase in wisdom and virtue can not be limited. And a nation can not be free and prosperous, if it neglects its primary duty of training all its youth for the duties, as well as the rights, of citizenship.

The last Census of the United States, 1860, reports the whole number of colleges, academies and schools in the country, at 113,006, in which were employed 148,742 teachers, with 5,417,880 pupils. The annual expenditures amounted to \$33,990,482. Of these institutions, 445 were called collegiate, with 54,969 students ; the academies numbered 6,636, with 455,559 pupils. The number of public schools was 106,915, with 4,917,552 scholars. The number of libraries in the country was 27,730, with 13,316,379 volumes, of which 8,149 were private, 6,205 were Sunday School, and 213 were collegiate. The increase between 1850 and 1860, was 26 per cent. in the number of schools, 40 per cent. in the number of teachers, 48 per cent. in the number of pupils, and 110 per cent. in the income. The average number of pupils was one in six of the entire population ; the average annual income for each pupil was \$6.27 ; the total cost of education was \$1.26, to each "free white person" then in the Union. The income for public schools was \$22,297,865, an increase of 133 per cent. since 1850.

The largest grant made by any government at a single time, for educational purposes, was that of our Congress, during the war, of 30,000 acres of land to each state, for each of its Senators and Representatives in Congress, the proceeds to

be applied to the founding of institutions for the promotion of agricultural and mechanical education. This grant was restricted to the loyal States. Their Senators and Representatives numbered 234; which would make a donation of 7,020,000 acres. At \$1.25 per acre, the government price, the sum total would be \$8,775,000. Extended to the other States, the total value would be over eleven millions of dollars.

In most of the States and large cities, reports on the condition of education are annually published.* From some of these we extract and condense various facts to show the general condition of our public schools. In the State of New York the number of school-houses is 11,780, of the value of ten millions of dollars; these are furnished with 1,183,017 vols. in school libraries, valued at \$600,000. The number of children between the ages of 5 and 21 is 1,364,967; the number attending public schools, (the attendance is voluntary,) is 938,000; there are also 97,000 in academies and 1,541 in colleges. The number of teachers, is 26,469, 4,452 male, 22,017 female; average salaries in cities \$563, in the country \$169. The total amount raised for schools in the

* Among the most voluminous and valuable of these Reports for the current year, are :

The Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education, Massachusetts. Joseph White, Secretary. pp. 528. Boston, 1867.

Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Boston, by R. C. Waterston. pp. 350. Boston, 1867.

Seventy-Ninth Annual Report of the Regents of the University of the State of New York. John V. L. Pruyn, Chancellor. pp. 500. Albany, 1866.

Thirteenth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Institutions in the State of New York, V. M. Rice. pp. 306. Albany, 1867.

Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, J. P. Wickersham. pp. 334. Harrisburg, 1867.

Thirteenth Annual Report of the State Commissioners of Common Schools, Ohio, Jno. A. Norris. pp. 174. Columbus, O., 1867.

Sixth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Institutions of the State of Illinois, Newton Bateman. pp. 240.

Annual Report of the Board of St. Louis Public Schools, for 1866. St. Louis, 1866.

State in 1866, was \$7,378,858, or about eight dollars for each pupil in attendance. In the 268 public schools of the City of New York, there are 219,000 pupils; the amount expended is \$2,298,508. The New York Free Academy, (or College,) with 819 pupils, receives annually from the State \$125,000. The schools of the cities are entirely free, the pupils being supplied with books, stationary, etc.

In the State of Massachusetts there are 255,323 children; the attendance at schools is 231,685; the amount expended is \$2,574,974—about \$10 for each child. The school fund is two millions. In the City of Boston, \$776,375 are expended for schools, with 27,723 pupils. The primary schools number 256, the grammar schools 78, the high schools 3—with 703 teachers. The State of Pennsylvania expended in 1866, \$4,195,258 on public schools, with 478,056 pupils; Illinois, \$4,439,238 for 614,659 pupils in a population of two millions; Wisconsin \$1,190,289 for 234,265 pupils. Ohio has 11,256 school-houses, 728,990 pupils, 332,641 vols. in the school libraries, and raised in 1866, \$5,059,938 for instruction. The State of Indiana has a school fund of over seven millions. The State of Michigan, not yet 25 years old, has already the richest university in the country, with 1,225 students, to whom the institution is free. In Minnesota, still further West, one eighteenth of the land in each township is reserved for education; the school fund is already over a million of dollars, and if the remaining lands are sold at no higher rates, the fund will be over twenty millions of dollars; its population is now 340,000. The City of St. Louis expended (1866,) \$340,770, on its excellent schools with 16,228 enrolled scholars. California raises for each scholar \$6.58; the school children since 1863, have increased twenty-five per cent. These are but the gleanings of a few facts to illustrate the interest taken in our public schools and their growth. During the war the number of pupils, and the expenditures constantly increased. According to the Census of the U. S. for 1860, the whole amount then raised for education, in the six

States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois and Wisconsin, was \$12,717,289; the Reports for these same States, for 1866, give the amount at \$24,838,555, or nearly double. To make the system fully effective two things are still needed: one is, the compulsory attendance of all children who are not elsewhere taught: the other is, that the system should be extended into all the Southern and South-western States, and there embrace all the children, both white and black.

There has also been a like advance in the receipts of our chief philanthropic and missionary associations during the past few years. Into all the details connected with these organizations it would be impracticable to enter. I have compared the aggregate receipts of about 25 of them, as given in the Reports of 1866, with the amounts reported in 1860—the year after and the year before the war. And the result is, that about two and a quarter millions were given in 1860, and something over five millions in the last year.

Among these Societies are the American Bible Society, \$734,089; the American Board of Foreign Missions, \$446,942; the Presbyterian Boards of Domestic and Foreign Missions, together over \$500,000; the Reformed Dutch Board, \$93,000—of which \$56,500 was from a single donor; the Methodist Boards of Missions, \$686,380; the American Home Missionary Society, \$212,567; the Board of the Protestant Episcopal Church, \$175,000; Baptist Home and Foreign Missions, \$368,537;* the Tract Societies of New York and Boston, \$679,617; various Education Societies, about \$125,000; American Sunday School Union, \$98,727; Congregational Union, \$130,000; Foreign and Christian Union, \$110,000; American Missionary Association, \$253,000; Seamen's Friends' Society, \$98,230; Female Guardian Society, N. Y., \$87,768, etc., etc.

* The Baptists have contributed over fifteen millions of dollars, during the last fifty years, for evangelizing purposes, of which about three millions were for foreign missions. See the Missionary Jubilee of the American Baptist Union, held in 1864, in Philadelphia, pp. 500. New York, 1865.

Besides these there are, e.g., in New York City, 24 Societies, which received last year, \$732,000 for local objects. The Public Charities of the city, paid by the State, amount to \$942,241. The Third Annual Report of the Board of State Charities in Massachusetts,* for 1866, gives the total amount expended in these charities in that State at about three millions of dollars per annum. The American Colonization Society, expended last year \$84,763, and sends this year to Liberia 1,200 emigrants; during the fifty years of its existence it has received over two and a half millions, and sent to Liberia 12,000 persons; in the Republic of Liberia, there are 150 churches and 200 schools, and it has under its control 200,000 aborigines. Among the most effective of the associations, laboring in a quiet way, is the New York Sabbath Committee, Philip Schaff, D.D., Secretary, which has had a great influence in promoting the due observance of the Christian Sabbath, and incidentally helping on the cause of temperance, especially in our metropolis. By a strict excise law, no liquor can now be sold in this city on the Sabbath. The National Temperance Society is reviving in its influence, as its need is increasingly felt. In Maine and Massachusetts, the policy of prohibition in respect to the traffic in liquor is successfully maintained. But in the country, as a whole, intemperance has been on the increase during the past few years. Our foreign population, as a general fact, are opposed to both our Sabbath and Temperance usages. One of our greatest moral and social problems is the assimilation of this population to the principles and methods of our American Christianity, a task which can only be slowly accomplished.

Young Men's Christian Associations, made up of the flower of our youth, are organized in all our cities, and doing a noble work. Their Conventions, like the one just held at Montreal, have assumed not only a national, but an international im-

* S. G. Howe, chairman. This is the most full Report published in the country.

portance. They reach far beyond the bounds of action of any one denomination, and bind our Christian young men fast together. The system of Sunday Schools has also been developed in this land in large proportions, and with wide ramifications. All our churches train, in such schools, their youths in precept and doctrine, and thus compensate, though in an insufficient degree, for the comparative disuse of strict catechetical instruction. The American Sunday School Union works beneficently, by multiplied agencies through the land, and reaches many youth who would otherwise be neglected and outcast. The children rejoice in these schools.

The undersigned had hoped to present a tolerably full account of the various churches into which our Christianity is divided. But the length of the Report, and the pressure of time, will allow only a condensation of the leading facts.

Foremost in numbers and zeal is the *Methodist Episcopal Church*. Last year it celebrated the centenary of its introduction into this country. Proposing to raise a thank-offering of a million, its receipts have actually come near to four millions, a large part of which is to be devoted to the interests of education. The Northern Church reports 64 annual Conferences; 13,172 preachers; 1,039,184 church-members, (an increase during a year of 102,925); 82,925 baptisms of adults and children; 10,462 church buildings, of the value of thirty millions of dollars; 25 colleges and theological schools; a Book Concern with a capital of \$837,000, and 56 official periodicals with a circulation of a million a month. The *Methodist Church South*, separated in 1844, with 1,345 ministers, 495,282 members, now has about 700,000 communicants. Other branches are, *Methodist Protestants*, 105,000; African Methodists, about 112,000; the Evangelical Association, (Albrights,) 56,734; Wesleyan Methodists: 25,670; Free Methodists, (since 1860,) 4,890; Primitive Methodists, 1,805. The total Methodist Church membership is over two millions. In Canada, there are 85,000. All this is the growth of a cen-

tury; in 1826, there were 360,800 members. No church in the country is moving onward with a more definite aim or larger plans. Among the German population it has 334 preachers and 30,000 church members. In Germany, it has 84 preachers and 5,370 members; in France, 119 preachers and 1,858 members. Its appropriations for foreign and domestic missions, for 1867, amount to \$1,030,978. Some of the subdivisions may soon be reunited with the main branch of this church; but the Southern Churches still stand aloof.

Next in number are the *Baptists*. Their total church membership is given at 1,689,845, with 17,220 churches, viz.: Regular Baptists, 1,040,303; Campbellites, (Disciples,) 309,000; Free Will Baptists, 56,258; Seventh Day Baptists, 7,014; Six-Principle Baptists, (Heb. vi, 1-3,) 3,000; Winebrennarians, (Church of God,) 23,800; Anti-mission Baptists, 50,000; Christians, (Unitarians,) 180,000; Dunkers, (Tunkers,) 20,000. The Northern and Southern Baptists act independently: the Southern number 645,551. The denomination has 23 colleges, 11 theological schools, and 23 periodicals. The Northern Baptist Home Mission Society, 1867, reports its receipts at \$176,889, (\$70,000 larger than last year); the Missionary Union, \$191,714; the Publication Society, \$199,727; the Bible Society, \$51,457. The Southern Baptists report, 1867, \$44,000 for domestic missions; \$22,000 for foreign missions, with 16 missionaries. The Baptists have a number of churches of Germans, and 200 missionaries in Germany and Scandinavia. Large subscriptions, amounting to more than a million of dollars, have been recently made for their colleges and theological seminaries. The Mennonites, numbering (1858,) 110 churches and 36,280 members; the Reformed Mennonites, 5,000 members, and the Hooker (Amish) Mennonites, are also Baptists. An attempt to unite the Campbellites with the regular Southern Baptists has failed. In Canada and the West Indies, the Baptists number 795 churches and 79,507 members.

The Presbyterian Churches. Outside of New England,

where Congregationalism has the ground, the Presbyterian churches extend, in various subdivisions, throughout the country. The main branch of the church was divided in 1838, on divers questions of doctrine and polity. The two main divisions are popularly, not ecclesiastically, known as Old School and New School. The *Old School*, 1867, reports 35 synods, 176 presbyteries, 2,622 churches, 2,302 ministers, 246,350 communicants, and contributions to the amount of \$3,731,164. In its foreign missions it has 40 churches, 330 ministers and teachers, 1,200 members. The *New School*, 1867, reports 23 synods, 109 presbyteries, 1,870 ministers, 161,539 communicants, 163,242 Sunday School scholars, and contributions of \$3,106,870 for all its objects. Its increase last year was 10,938 members, and nearly a million of dollars in contributions. The *United Presbyterian Church*, was formed in 1853, by a union of the Associate Presbyterian and Associate Reformed Churches. It reports, 1867, 7 synods, 54 presbyteries, 543 ministers, 717 congregations, 63,489 members, \$1,277,204 contributions. In the eight years of its history, it has increased in its ministry from 408 to 543; and in its contributions from an average of 41 cents per member to an average of nine dollars. It has missionary presbyteries in India, China, Syria and Oregon. It is anti-slavery and close communion in its character. The *Presbyterian Church in the United States*, (the style of the Southern Church,) was formed by a union of the Old and New School Churches during the war. They report, 1867, 10 synods, 46 presbyteries, 66,528 communicants, 829 ministers, 1,290 churches. The contributions are set down as \$409,282. There are 340 churches and 4 presbyteries, from which there is no report. The numbers given are probably much below the facts. There is no present prospect of reünion with the Northern churches. The *Cumberland Presbyterian Churches*, North and South, are reünited. They had before the war 588 ministers and 48,600 members. An effort to unite with the Southern church is in progress. The Associate Reformed Presbyterians of

the South also maintain an independent organization. The *Reformed Presbyterians* in the North have two synods, one of about 100, the other of about 60 ministers. The General Synod that met in New York, in 1867, appointed a committee on reünion with other Presbyterian organizations. The tendency to reünion, especially among the Presbyterian churches, is rapidly gaining ground. The Old and New School Assemblies have this year adopted a plan of reünion, covering all the questions in debate, which is published for further discussion, and will be acted upon next year. Now that slavery is abolished, one of the chief obstacles to reünion is taken out of the way. A united Presbyterian church, numbering some 700,000 members, would have a great and growing influence.

The Congregationalists. Churches, 2,780 ; ministers, 2,919 ; members, 267,453. Including Canada, there are 2,900 churches, 3,009 ministers, 272,974 members. The gain last year was 60 churches, 3,913 members, 28 ministers. Of the churches, 1,518 are in New England. The amount of contributions reported is \$1,024,720 ; but there was no report from thirteen states and territories. The American Home Missionary, and the American Board of Foreign Missions, the American Education Society, the American Tract Society of New England, and the American Missionary Association, are chiefly supported by Congregationalists. The great National Council, of 511 members, which assembled in Boston, in 1865, gave a new impulse to the denomination. No body of Christians was more earnest for the national cause throughout our late war. It is rapidly extending especially in the Western States.

The *Unitarian Congregationalists* have 289 societies, (of which 171 are in Massachusetts,) and 355 ministers. The contributions for various objects amounted to \$235,900.

The *Lutheran Church* numbers, in all, 421 synods, 1,644 ministers, 2,915 congregations, 323,825 communicants. Of these, there are connected with the General Synod, 23 synods,

695 ministers, 1,255 congregations and 110,450 communicants. The rest are embraced in other synods. There is a General Synod at the South. A new synod is projected, on the basis of a more strict adherence to the symbols; a convention for this object was held at Reading, Pa., in Dec., 1866, attended by representatives from 15 synods;*but no further action has yet been taken. The two western Scandinavian synods number 40,000 members. The emigration from Scandinavia alone last year was 29,000, chiefly Lutheran. There are 29 Lutheran periodicals in the United States, (14 of which are in the German language,) 15 theological schools, and 17 colleges.

The Protestant Episcopal Church numbers 34 dioceses, 44 bishops, 2,416 priests and deacons, 2,305 parishes, 161,234 communicants, 151,819 Sunday School scholars. Its contributions in 1866, were over three millions of dollars. The Southern dioceses, separated during the war, are now restored. The Board of Foreign Missions expended \$71,000; domestic missions \$54,465. The receipts of the Evangelical Knowledge Society were \$40,998. Twenty-eight of the bishops of this church have published a protest against ritualistic innovations.

The Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, 1867. Churches, 444; ministers, 461; communicants, 57,846; Sunday School scholars 46,411; contributions for congregational objects, \$765,980, for benevolent objects \$277,209. Its last Synod, by a vote of 109 to 10, has submitted the question of dropping the word "Dutch" from its title, and adopting the name of the "Reformed Church in America."

German Reformed Church. Triennial Synod, 1866. Both classes from the late Confederate States, Va. and N. C., were represented. It has 2 synods, 29 classes, 476 ministers, 1,162 churches, 109,258 communicants, 11,088 baptisms; contributions for benevolent objects \$60,882; 5 colleges and 3 theological schools; 9 periodicals. The Tercentenary of the Heidelberg Catechism was duly celebrated, and an excellent

edition of the same was issued. In connection with this, more than \$100,000 were raised for the colleges of the church. It is proposed to drop the word "German" from the title of the church. A new Liturgy is under discussion, opposed chiefly on account of its high sacramental tendencies.

The United Brethren in Christ, (organized 1774,) is "Arminian in doctrine and Methodistic in polity." It has 4,255 preaching places, 3,297 societies, 91,570 members; contributions \$341,279.

The Moravians. 89 mission stations; 307 preaching places; 213 missionaries, male and female, and 882 assistants; expended \$120,189. Under the religious instruction of the Unitus Fratrum there are 177,669 persons in Europe and America. The adult communicants number 14,240.

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States consists of 43 dioceses, 3 vicariates-apostolic, 45 bishops—the diocese of Baltimore being the Metropolitan See. There are 3,795 churches, 2,317 clergymen, 49 ecclesiastical institutions, 29 colleges, 134 schools for girls, 66 asylums, 26 hospitals. The whole number of Roman Catholics in North and South America, is supposed to be forty-five millions; in the United States there are probably about four millions—much less than the immigration of Catholics with its natural increase. The Second National Council of this church was held in Baltimore, Oct., 1866; it professed anew the unconditional adhesion of the church to the papacy and its temporal power. The amount subscribed to the papal loan in the United States, to March 1st, was \$2,300,000. The power of Catholicism is here chiefly felt in the large towns, where foreigners congregate; its political influence is strong in a few localities.

The Universalists number about 600,000; they raised for their denominational objects last year \$1,665,000; they propose collecting \$100,000 for a missionary fund. There have been some attempts at a union between them and the Unitarians.

The *Friends* or *Quakers* of the orthodox side number 54,

000; the Hicksites, 40,000. They contributed largely to the funds for the relief of soldiers during the war, and aid the freedmen liberally. In Philadelphia they have recently contributed \$125,000, for a school for colored youth. The *Shakers* number 4,700; the *Second Adventists*, 20,000; the *Swedenborgians*, 5,000; the *Mormons*, 70,000, recruited chiefly from Europe and now divided among themselves; the *Spiritualists*—an indefinite number, easily exaggerated.

Such is the marvellous commingling of churches in the midst of which we live and labor. But in all this diversity of tongues, there is still one language. We have one Lord, one faith and one baptism. Our differences are chiefly external and superficial; one union is internal and vital. The tendencies to reünion are growing in all the denominations. The centrifugal force has well nigh spent itself, and the centripetal is beginning to claim its rights.

We know that we have great difficulties, and that in respect to some of them we can derive but little light from the past. We have a vast social, as well as religious, problem to solve. A whole race, redeemed from slavery, is to be Christianized. The North and South are to be reünited, and only the Gospel can effect this. The Southern churches have suffered largely from the war; they still decline to work with us; but we hope the time is not far distant when these alienations will be forgotten. We have also a large and increasing emigrant population to mould into harmony with our national spirit and religious life; during the present year they have come to us at the rate of a thousand a day, and the land is broad and rich enough to hold many more. But they come chiefly for material gain, and we must win them to higher objects. Our material prosperity, our wealth, our mines, our rapid growth, imperil our future unless we have a new baptism from above.

Bretheren of the Alliance! In the name of our Branch we offer to you our cordial Christian salutations. We are one with you in the common work of our evangelical Christianity

—against Romanism and infidelity—for freedom, religious and civil, everywhere; in all works of charity to help the weak and raise the fallen, and to speed the progress of the Gospel. Pray for us, as we also offer our prayers for you. We trust that our alliance with you may help us to do our work better, and bind us closer to Christ's people all over the Old World. In such union is strength.

[The Report concluded with an invitation to hold the next General Conference of the Alliance in the City of New York.]

ART. IV.—PROGRESSIVE APPREHENSION OF DIVINE TRUTH.

By REV. JULIUS SEELYE, Professor in Amherst College.

ON attending, a few years since, the Anniversary of a so-called liberal school in theology, and arriving late—the exercises having already begun—the first phrase which fell upon a visitor's ear was, "progress in religion." During the services these words were often repeated—the young speakers dwelling upon them with evident delight—though, from all their utterances, it was difficult to frame any clear and consistent definition for the words so freely employed. Lack of clearness and of depth might, in these instances, be easily chargeable to immaturity of development, but, among those not wanting either in years or in a certain kind of culture, progress in religion or theology is often obscurely and often erroneously apprehended. The terms themselves are well chosen. The plan which it has pleased God to adopt in the procedure of His kingdom, can only be accomplished progressively. This the Bible amply affirms and the history of the Church abundantly illustrates. But it behooves us to know distinctly what is implied in such an expression. When it is said that God's plans have a progressive development, we do not mean thereby that He is progressively adding to them anything new. "Known unto God are all His works from the

beginning of the world." "He is of one mind; who can turn Him?" The development is not, properly speaking, in the plans of God, but in us and our apprehension of them. They do not change any more than does their Author, who is and was and is to come, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. But, as it is the same sun which shines in the dawning twilight and the completed day, so the same truth may reveal itself, first in the glimmering which hardly breaks the midnight, and subsequently in the glory which rises to the perfect noon. That which changes, is our point of vision, our capacity for receiving light, and the precise statement of the doctrine before us is, that God educates man from age to age unto a larger acquaintance with Himself and His truth. The truth does not grow, but the human race, from generation to generation, enlarges in the capacity to apprehend it.

In other words, as applied to the Bible, which is the true statement of God's plans, to which nothing shall be added, and from which nothing can be removed, the doctrine is that the Sacred Scriptures can not be most adequately apprehended at the time when they are first propounded. It is neither the prophet that declares the message, who has the clearest vision of its Divine significance, nor the people that at first receive it, who can penetrate most deeply its interior fullness. The same Holy Ghost who inspires His prophets and illumines His people unto any declaration or knowledge of His truth, abides, with increasing manifestations of His power, in His Church, and by the constant Providence and continued indwelling presence by which He guards and guides its history according to His own will, He is giving to the world, from age to age, some larger view of His plans, some broader interpretation of His Word, bringing to light what was at first obscure; and showing new applications to what at first may have seemed to be fully apprehended—not denying what had been revealed before, but clothing all this in a clearer light, and thus conducting His Church continually from the vision as through a glass darkly, more and more nearly unto the vision face to face.

And that this doctrine is true, is made evident alike from the Bible and from history. These two are but counterparts of each other. The history of the world is but the larger volume of which the Bible is an epitome. Like the Bible, human history begins with Eden, and passes through its scenes of sin and sorrow, of life and love, till it shall also end where the Bible ends, in the New Jerusalem, the tabernacle of God with men. But what could our first parents, when driven forth from the Eden which had passed, know of the New Jerusalem which was to come? When the promise was proclaimed: the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head—how large it was, indeed, but how small the apprehension of it! I have obtained this seed, said Eve, when she brought forth her first-born; I have gotten the man, the Lord; the promised avenger has come! But how long the distance, and how sad the journey, till the true Deliverer actually appeared! What sighs and weary watchings for His coming; what alternate hopes and fears; what mingled light and darkness in the minds of those who caught some glimpses of the coming glory! And yet, as we now regard it, what a steady growing of the dawn; what increasing manifestations of the fullness of the wondrous scheme, does the history between the Fall and Incarnation represent! But when the Messiah came, the Son of God and Son of Man, it was only the fulfillment of the promise given at the Fall. Nothing has been added to the promise or the plan, but they needed the fulness of time for their full disclosure. And since the Incarnation, who does not see in what a clearer light the Redeemer and his work have appeared, by the relations in which they are now seen to stand, to all succeeding history? As the disciples themselves, who looked upon the face of Christ, and beheld his works and listened to his words, needed something more than this, even that history which could only be transacted after the death of their Master, in order that they might know the wide-reaching meaning of his mission—so has the Church, in which he dwells, and which is his body, needed, since the

Apostolic age, time to complete its stature; it has had to grow towards the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God; the imperfect views of one generation have had to be adjusted by the clearer vision of another, in order that Christ's disciples might be no longer children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, but as the grain grows from the blade to the ear, and after that to the full corn in the ear, so they passing from childhood through advancing stages unto maturity, might grow up into Him in all things, who is the Head.

But if we turn from this general view, and seek, in the history of the Church, a particular illustration of this truth, we find one quite significant and near at hand, in the different views which the Romanist and the Protestant have entertained respecting the doctrines of salvation. This doctrine was the central inquiry in all the discussions of the Papacy and Protestantism. Beneath the rites of the Papacy, and at the basis of all its assumptions, we find the paramount claim that these are essential in order to salvation. The misguided method of seeking it, through works which men could do rather than through the grace which God alone could give, should not hide from us that spiritual state which was the constant object of search. And the same question was as deep in the hearts of the Reformers as it had been prominent on the lips of the priests. The central point in Protestantism is not, as too often stated, a protest against Romish authority. The great truth of the Reformation was that our own works can not justify us before God, and that our salvation is not to be wrought out by us, but can only be accomplished for us and in us by the all-perfect work of the Great Redeemer. This, from that time, has been the essential element of Protestantism, and is still the one point wherein its distinction from the Papacy is most clearly noted. The Romanist still, as of old, maintains that, as the Church is the necessary means for faith, it is only by the Church that a soul can come to

Christ; while Protestantism, now as ever, declares that membership of Christ's body is only through a participation of his life and spirit, and that no soul can come truly to the Church except as it has first come to Him. The Protestant being justified by faith, and thus having peace with God, has no need of priestly mediation, and being enlightened by the Holy Ghost unto the knowledge of God, can not submit that the church should impose upon him blindly her interpretation of the Word of God. His salvation is his own, and that Word which gives him all his light about his future pathway, has too precious a relation to him to be handed over lightly to any other keeping. As it is God's message to his soul, he is to interpret it for himself, with the solemn sense, indeed, of the momentous issues which depend upon its meaning, but with the deep conviction also that in the last appeal this meaning must be such as his own private judgment can approve.

If now the doctrine of the progressive apprehension of Divine truth be clearly stated and sufficiently illustrated, it may be well to inquire what dangers and duties are thereby revealed to the church of our day? These will readily appear if, taking our stand on the Protestant ground, we notice the two courses which, in very different directions, are obviously open before us. It is quite possible for us to stop short where the Reformers stopped and believe there is no advance to be made beyond; or it is equally practicable to break away entirely from their position, and cast off every restraint by which they were controlled. The one course logically pursued would lead us back to the Papacy, while the other would land us in the labyrinth of all unbelief. And now it can not be denied—and it were most unwise to ignore the fact—that the Protestantism of our day is gravely threatened in both these directions. The chief danger of Protestantism, at the present time, is of this two-fold sort: the danger of discarding, on the one side, that progressive element in which it had its birth, and of abandoning, on the other, what alone can give

inspiration and life to any progress ; or, in other words, the danger of merging our position in that of the Papist, and of not distinguishing between it and that of the unbeliever. No one can fail to see these two extremes strongly marked in the tendencies of the times, and abundantly represented among so-called Protestants themselves. It is not peculiar to Oxford nor to the English Church that doctrines like those of the "Tracts for the Times," on the one side, and the "Essays and Reviews," on the other, should both spring from the ranks of nominal Protestants. The same is true here and all over the Protestant world. There are not wanting among us staunch and earnest defenders of the Reformation—noble souls indeed, and holy—who are yet ready to put the ban of severest churchly censure upon whatsoever attempt is made to change the expression of the Christian doctrine as left by the Reformers. To question whether Calvinism is an adequate statement of the truth for us, or to seek some different expression ~~or~~ proportion for the Institutes of the Christian faith than Calvin has presented, has received, and is receiving still, among Protestants themselves, a treatment which illustrates this remark too conspicuously to require further notice. Let us not be found wanting in reverence for that kingly spirit whom God raised up among the Reformers to revive their faith and strengthen their courage and make them mighty in the conflict for the truth—a spirit so serene and lofty and truth-loving, that generations and centuries of the Church have delighted to venerate him ; in whom Augustine almost seems to live again, and Paul almost to utter himself once more, and who is reviled or derided only by those who are either without the wisdom which can see his exalted merits, or the goodness which can approve them. But to make any man, however lofty, the sufficient teacher for all mankind—to suppose that any words which human thoughts have breathed can express the fulness of that Word which the Holy Ghost inspired, is not only to deny that progressive manifestation of God's truth which we have seen to be necessary, but it is

to take a position which would logically deny the validity of Protestantism itself. Why should we hold so inflexibly to the doctrines of the Reformers, and discard so imperiously the decrees of the church? Is there any ground on which we can deny the right of private judgment to the one, which would not also exclude it from the other? The answer is plain enough, and the open road to which it leads has been taken, and is still pursued, by many wanderers. The change from Protestantism to Romanism is in nowise difficult, when the most radical ground of the two is the same.

But we call this change a perversion, and rightly so. However logically consistent with its premises, the premises are radically wrong. It is not Protestant to deny the right of open, fair and searching criticism, of any statement of doctrines which human lips have uttered by man's devising, however hoary with age, or venerable by usage, or hallowed by association with the conflicts of the Church, or however supported by whatever men such a statement may be. Protestantism demands a truth-loving and reverent spirit, in the eyes which seek to scrutinize the deep mysteries of the Christian Doctrine, but it has no fear of such a spirit, and boldly bids it come, and reverently, with the angels, look as deeply as it may into these things. He who has any fear that one truth will suffer because another may be sought, does not know the truth. He who is afraid that the doctrine which he holds may lose some ground if questioned or assailed, has no right to hold the doctrine. He who is timidly anxious lest each incoming wave shall undermine the edifice in which he rests, has himself abundant reason for the question whether he has built his house upon the rock or on the sand. The truth shines with a lustre more radiant because of every loving inquiry, and reveals itself with a strength more majestic after every hostile attack. A true Protestant welcomes all discussion. He is not afraid of it. Even if it comes in manifest malignity, from undoubted opposition to the truth, there is no occasion for disturbance. Let it come, and let him who

fears the issue yield the conflict, as he ought. It is only by giving the largest scope to free discussion and unrestrained inquiry that we can successfully maintain our Protestantism. Unless we allow the same freedom of thought in reference to ourselves, which we claim in reference to the Papist, we can urge no reason why Protestantism should not go back to the Papacy, and allow the darkness which rested on medieval Europe to settle over the Christian world again.

But we meet just here a question which brings another danger from the opposite field to view. The Romanist himself, forgetting that in all ages scepticism has been the outgrowth of superstition, asks us if the unbelief, so rife in some parts of the Protestant world at the present day, is not the result of just this free inquiry. And the unbelief is ready with its affirmative response, and boldly claims that the Protestant principle legitimately carried out would lead to the renunciation of every positive creed and faith.

The Reformation, it is widely asserted, was essentially a rebellion against Papal authority. It was—according to a favorite expression of some—a rupture of the mind with external and positive restraint; it was the shaking off the shackles; it was the affirmation of freedom; it was a protest against foreign coercion in all matters of religion. From this the inference is easy, that the chief aim of Protestantism should be to complete what was thus begun, until perfect freedom, in religious things, should be secured to every man. But how can such freedom be maintained, it is asked, so long as the Church proposes any coercion, or the Bible any restraint? Must not the mind which shall become truly free emancipate itself also from these? Do not the Church and the Bible arrogate to themselves an external and positive authority, from which a true Protestantism must struggle for deliverance? These are no imaginary inquiries. They are among the gravest and most startling questions of the times.

But they rest upon an entire mistake both of Protestantism and the true principle of progress. For, on the one hand,

the Reformation was not, chiefly, a rebellion against Papal authority. It was, as we have already noticed, a protest against the Papal doctrine of salvation; it was a penetration into a deeper depth than the Church had yet attained of the unfathomed fulness of the Sacred Word, and affirmed a truth respecting the fellowship of the soul with God, which, though uttered long before, had never previously been so deeply nor so widely seen. Such a doctrine, therefore, does not lead in any such direction as would ignore the Church or set aside the Bible. On the contrary, it blossoms and bears its fruit in and for the Church, while it strikes its roots down deeply in the Sacred Word. The Reformers did not—as has been very superciliously and quite superficially argued*—arrest the Reformation because they sought to rear it as a living temple on the Bible as its chief corner stone. Rather did it thus become a truly living product, and was able thus to grow into a holy temple to the Lord. No one who looks closely at the Reformation can fail to see that it would have lost its life and power and glory, could its faith in Scripture as the undoubted word of God have been destroyed.

But the view considered equally mistakes the true principle of progress. Instead of the Bible being a hindrance, a clog and fetter which must be shaken off that the progressive march of reason may be unimpeded, it furnishes the true inspiration and only safe guide to progress. As we have already seen, the true meaning of development, as applied to the Christian system, is not a growth in the plan of God, but only in its manifestation. The plan was full when the promise was declared: The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head—and all the addition subsequently made in Scripture, was but a farther explanation and a more full disclosure of what this pregnant word contained. And since the sacred canon was completed, all true progress in the Church has been but a legitimate growth from this, its normal seed.

* Westminster Review, April, 1863.

The Reformation itself sprang from a deeper view of Scripture, and the flippant tongue which can declare that the Reformers arrested this movement because they still accepted the authority of the Bible, might, with equal propriety, speak of continuing the currents of life when the beating heart was gone.

But not only must all religious progress be grounded in the Bible, there is no progressive movement for the well being of mankind but that springs from the same soil. That which has eaten out the life of all the civilizations which have appeared and flourished and decayed, is nothing but the want of something which the Bible contains. To take away the Bible because it is supposed to interfere with the natural light of reason is precisely the absurdity of putting out the sun that our natural eyes may see. But if it were not so, and if this natural light of reason could reveal, with perfect clearness, the perfect path, yet history gives us no more prominent and impressive teaching than that this is not sufficient to lead men to pursue it. Men will not take the wisest course simply by having it revealed to them. They will not do their duty simply because they know what it is. It is a most narrow reading of history, and a most shallow understanding of the heart, which has not yet learned that something more than knowledge is necessary in order to virtue, and something other than light in order to life. There have been many systems of natural morality propounded by heathen sages, but they have not transformed the heathen character. There were moralists in Greece and Rome before the coming of Christ, who taught abstract principles of virtue in a pure and lofty form, but their teaching had no virtuous result. It was fruitless of any change in the common life of the Greek and Roman people. It left them as it found them, "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without

understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." The picture is not overdrawn. The languages and literatures and arts and habits and history of these people, reproduce every feature here delineated. That which makes the Gospel any more effective, in the the transformations it has, undoubtedly, wrought in society, is the life-giving spirit with which it can brood over the chaos of the natural social state and evolve therefrom the order and beauty and life of the new creation. The system of Christian morality, is, indeed, more perfect than any which heathen sages have propounded, but this is not its principal claim. Vinet has remarked that the glory of the Gospel is not so much that it furnishes us a new morality as that it gives us a power to practice the old. While, therefore, it is neither unprotestant nor anti-progressive to cling to the Bible, it is both these to let go our hold of it.

But is the Bible then, beyond the province of lawful inquiry? Are we to affirm the right of every man to interpret its meaning, and yet deny to any man the right to question its authorship? By no means. This is not Protestantism. On the contrary we admit the fullest right of free inquiry and discussion even here. We not only admit, we court it. We challenge all the scrutiny and criticism which can be directed to these records, not doubting that the issue will continue as it has always hitherto been, to inspire the church, not only with a more intelligent, but a stronger faith in Scripture.

The true Protestantism, with a clear knowledge of its origin and a hearty acceptance of its mission, occupies in our day the position of a healthy conservatism, between the papist, who denies the authority of private interpretation of the Bible, and the sceptic, who denies the authority of any interpretation at all. Its duty in reference to them both is therefore clear, and is comprehensively the same. As it is, in itself, an advancing stage in the progressive manifestation of Christ's kingdom, it would ill accord with it, to dis-

card the law which has given it life, and deny that the principle which has reached as far as its origin, may not also extend beyond it. A true Protestantism will welcome everything truly progressive, not counting itself to have fully apprehended, or thinking itself already perfect, but pressing forward in the confidence that God will yet reveal unto His church, by His Spirit, a more glorious vision of Himself, than the eye hath seen or the heart conceived. But, on the contrary, it will not expect this disclosure, in any other light than through the rising of that Sun of Righteousness which the Sacred Scriptures make known, and whose glory they declare is yet to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. The chief duty of Protestantism is hence with these Scriptures. It is clearly to declare and publish them abroad. Neither attacks upon the Papacy, nor polemics against infidelity are our most important work. If we can only pour the light of the Scriptures, clear and in full-orbed glory upon the world, all the power of the Papacy vanishes as the night before the morning, and the forms of infidelity disappear as glow-worms cease to shine when the day has come. The Bible does not need any defence, so much as it needs a proclamation. It defends itself wherever it is known. Deep in every soul, there dwells forever a witness to the truth, whose clear eye and steady voice will see and respond to it whenever it is known. We do not need to implore men to believe the truth, we only need that they shall adequately apprehend it, and then we may defy them to deny it. And thus the Bible, as eternal truth, needs no other argument for its support, than itself clearly preached. There are defenders of the truth who think it otherwise. They treat the Bible like a weakly infant, which must be bolstered up and carefully sustained lest it fall. And so they bring together their learning and philosophy,—their human reasoning and research, which they use as props to keep the Bible up,—trembling all the while lest one of these should fail, and the truth, unsupported, sink to its hurt. But the Bible disdains

all these appliances. It is no weakly infant! It has more than a giant's strength, and can not only stand unaided, but can walk forth alone conquering and to conquer.

How wanting is the Bible in those appliances, with which its preachers so often seek to defend it, in syllogisms, in logical subtleties, in refined deductions and argumentation! But how full of power it is to reach the conscience? How mighty, in the application of its pure truths to the naked soul! It comes to man, as a fallen being, but it nowhere undertakes to prove the fall. It simply states it, presupposing that the witness of it and its proof are in the heart of every man. And its statements are so terrible, that the sinner knowing them to be true, hides himself, like Adam, when he hears its voice, but they are at the same time, so full of tenderness, that if the sinner will but listen to them he will come forth from his hiding place, as Adam did, and make confession of his sins. This is the power of the Bible, and we may employ it by preaching the Bible just as it is, in all its application, only careful that we make the message clear, and then assured that God will give it cogency. The preaching of the Bible aids us in our knowledge of it, and is thus a step forward in the progressive manifestation of the truth it contains. The opposition of the sceptic, or the Romanist, on either hand, though evoked and made intense by the preaching of the Bible, will as surely disappear before its continued and increasing application, as the mists which the morning sun has called forth from the marches and fens, where the night has engendered them, vanish before his upward progress and continued shining. "The entrance of thy words giveth light, it giveth understanding to the simple." "My lips shall utter praise when thou hast taught me thy statutes." "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." "The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes."

ART. V.—CHURCH CREEDS.

BY REV. JOHN F. KENDALL, Baldwinville, N. Y.

The object of the present article is to discuss, as briefly as may be, the above-named subject, which, to bring the whole idea at once before the mind, may be stated in the following form: *Church Creeds; or Confessions of Faith, their History and Value, and their proper Limits for Use in the Public Reception of Believers into the Church.*

This subject has troubled not a few of the pastors of our churches. Each separate church often has its separate creed; and it seems to many as if order could be brought out of this confusion, only, either by the rejection of all local creeds, or by the adoption of a uniform standard in all our churches.

1. *What is a Creed?*

"This word," says Webster, "seems to have been introduced by the use of the Latin *credo*, 'I believe,' at the beginning of the Apostles' Creed." When used in a religious sense, which will be its only use in this article, it may be defined as "a brief, compact summary of Christian Doctrine." It is a statement, both scientific and technical, as exhaustive as is consistent with its necessary brevity, of the belief of the person or persons who frame it. The customary form for the commencement of all creeds is, "We believe." To answer our definition, a creed should be a brief and scientific compend of all the Scripture data, which bear upon the essential points of Christian doctrine, of which the creed treats. There is no room for argument, for the creed is the summing up and the conclusion of all argument, the fruit of the most exhaustive study.

2. *The Growth of Creeds.*

The question may arise, at this point, how creeds came to exist. They are of human origin. No full creeds are found in the earliest times of the Church, but they have been intro-

duced through a long series of conflicts. What causes may be assigned for their growth? Mainly three; of which one is by far the most important:

(1.) The growth of the *scientific spirit* in the Church.

The seat of religion is the heart. All our efforts to convert and save men begin with the admission that men are depraved, and that their hearts must be renewed. But while our first and main endeavor should be to renovate the heart, the mind also is not forbidden its proper activity in the realm of religion. Our knowledge of the way of salvation is contained in the Bible. While its highest value to us is its adaptation to our wants as sinners, yet the Bible also introduces us into a world of mysterious truths, pertaining to God, his character, his existence, his attributes, his methods of saving a lost race. The believer makes the Bible his study. He find here that nourishment for the soul, which is so essential to its growth. But in doing this his mind is aroused; he encounters the mysteries just named; he finds himself struggling with the vast problems which even the Bible has not theoretically solved. Thus, by a necessary sequence, not only is the heart, in conversion, awakened to life, but the mind also is stimulated to activity upon a class of themes, which never before occupied it; the scientific spirit is aroused; and by slow degrees, the various problems of the Bible, being solved, so far as the human mind aided by inspiration is able to solve them, there naturally succeeds the desire to secure the truths thus unfolded, by reducing them to a written form. Easily, thus, and almost without intending it, a creed may be formed.

The growth of creeds, however, by this process, would necessarily be very tardy. The mind naturally sluggish, the individual not wont to overtax himself for the mere sake of science, but, above all, the fact that no necessity at first is felt of making a scientific and guarded statement of Scripture truth since no doctrine seems to be imperilled without such statement, all these causes would combine to make the growth

of creeds exceedingly slow, as the result merely of the development of what we have termed the scientific spirit. Doubtless, with no operating cause but this, creeds would have arisen during the long history of the church ; but it may well be doubted whether this cause alone would ever have produced creeds, so true in their orthodoxy, and so guarded in their statements, as are now the common heritage of the church.

(2.) A second and far more prolific source of the growth of creeds, is found in the coming up of *Heresies*.

While the church is free from error, and especially while, as was the case in the earliest period of the church, Christian experience is ardent, there appears no especial need of an exact creed-statement of the points of Christian belief. A vigorous piety, which is *living* Christian doctrine, which daily feasts the soul upon the vital facts of revelation, will experience the truth, and be satisfied with the simple, untechnical language of Scripture, and will, at the same time, be quite unable to make a scientific statement of the articles of belief. A vigorous piety is the best preservative from erroneous doctrine.

After the lapse of time, however, either from a decline in piety, or from some other cause, heresies begin to creep into the church. The adherents of right doctrine are at once aroused to defend the faith. The truth is assailed and must find champions. But "what is truth?" The heretic claims that he has the very truth of the Bible. The orthodox, he says, has misinterpreted the Word of God. Both parties claim the Bible as teaching their peculiar beliefs ; and it is found that the time has come when the questions at issue can not be settled by a mere reference to the Scripture and an appeal to Scripture language ; but after a most searching and profound exegesis of the whole teaching of Scripture, upon the doctrine in debate, a statement of the truth must be made, of so technical and scientific a nature, as to be able to be claimed by the orthodox alone. And hence it is true

that heresy has been the prolific mother of creeds. The noblest, most valuable, and most universally received creeds of the Evangelical Church, have been the direct offspring of discussions with heresies.

Reference need be made only to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, in proof of this statement. No sooner has the church found herself confronted with an alarming heresy than the piety and learning of the church have been aroused to combat the error, with weapons drawn from the armory of divine truth, and such weapons that the enemy could not possibly employ them.

(3.) A third source of the growth of creeds, has been, *any form of False Doctrine.*

In the later ages of the church, particularly since the Reformation, there have been various forms of erroneous doctrine, which, while, perhaps, not meriting so strictly the title of heresy, have nevertheless been thought sufficiently detrimental to piety and orthodoxy, to deserve a condemnation in the form of creeds. Such have been the errors in Anthropology, held by some sects, respecting the doctrine of the fall and its consequences to the race: the errors of the Papal Church, such as the papal supremacy, the refusing of the cup to the laity, forbidding the clergy to marry, etc.; errors in Soteriology, ascribing a conjoint power to faith and works in the matter of our salvation, and such like. The multiplicity of creeds since the Reformation has been due more, perhaps, to this third source than to any other. The great battles with high-handed heresy had already been fought, but these lesser and more multiplied forms of error have given birth to various and somewhat numerous creeds.

If we pause now, a moment, to review the actual mode of the growth of creeds, we shall see that they have followed the order above indicated. The scientific spirit, working through three centuries, did not for these centuries give expression to a formal creed; if we except the Apostles' Creed, which is more scriptural than technical. Whence we learn

that the growth of creeds from this source alone would be very slow.

The first great heresy that arose within the church was the Arian, in the latter part of the third and beginning of the fourth century. The condemnation of that error, by the Council of Nice, furnished to the church in all coming time a creed-statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, embodying the substance of the scripture testimony on this all-important doctrine. Later errors respecting the proper divinity of the Holy Spirit, were corrected by the Council at Constantinople, A. D., 281; errors respecting the divine-human character of Christ, were met by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D., 451, and by the famous Athanasian Creed, beyond which symbol the church, on these points, has never gone.

Passing on then to the time of the Reformation, we find ourselves in the midst of the various lesser errors, creeping into the church through a period of several hundreds of years; and to meet these errors, we find the various Lutheran and Reformed symbols, the Augsburg Confession, striking at errors in the Anthropology, Soteriology, and other errors of the Church of Rome; the *Confessio Tetrapolitana*, differing from the Augsburg mainly in its more strictly scriptural doctrine of the Sacraments; the Basle and Helvetic Confessions and others, which need not be mentioned, each adapted to some peculiar phase in the life or history of the church.

And this process of creed-growth, we hold to be but natural. In its study of the Scripture, the devout mind must gather from all quarters the teachings of the Word; for purposes of devotion or instruction, the results of investigation will naturally fall into some simple form, chiefly in scriptural language, like the Apostles' Creed; and finally, after some great conflict, after overthrowing false doctrine and firmly establishing the true, the scientific mind and the Christian spirit naturally plant their banners, like the vanguard of an army, in an advanced and entrenched position. The fully-developed creed is the token of victory.

3. *The History of Creeds.*

We cannot dwell at length upon this topic, nor extend our review with any minuteness of detail over the centuries of church history, which have been most prolific of creeds; but we need only speak of a few of the earliest or most important, as indicative of the general course of their history.

The earliest of all the creeds in the church is the so-called "Apostles' Creed," or the *Symbolum Apostolicum*. The manner of the formation and growth of this creed has been a subject of much research. Rufinus, in the fourth century, maintained that it was actually a combination of elements, which the various apostles furnished; maintaining this from the etymology of the word *symbolum*: Greek, *σύμβολον*, from *συμβάλλειν*, to throw or put together, into one common stock, hence, *σύμβολον ὅτι ἕκαστος συνέβαλε*. This view is now generally if not universally rejected. Among the reasons for rejecting it are the facts, that it is found in different parts of the early church, with some considerable variations; that it is never referred to by any of the Fathers as being the direct work of the Apostles, and besides cannot be traced, in its present completed form, to an earlier period than the third century. It is, however, in all its parts strictly according to the apostolic teaching. Its earliest germs are doubtless to be found in the confession of Peter to Christ, (Mat. xvi, 16.) "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and in the trinitarian formula of Baptism, in the last chapter of Matthew. By slow degrees, and principally in scripture language, the facts of revelation were combined, till finally, in the third century, we find this creed, which, from its simplicity and its scriptural character, combined with its great breadth of signification, has been adopted by all parts of the Christian Church, in the language of Prof. Schaff, forming "the bond of unity for the Greek, the Roman and the Evangelical branches of the Church." This creed, the most ancient of any in the church, is, also, the briefest, and the foundation of all the prominent subsequent creeds.

The next creed, in point of time, was the famous Nicene Creed, framed at Nice, in the year 325, with the additions made at Constantinople, A. D., 381. The Apostles' Creed is essentially orthodox upon the doctrine of the Trinity; but, from the simplicity and purely scriptural character of its language, it was liable to misinterpretation, and to be understood as not necessarily denying the Arian heresy. It was therefore reserved for the Councils of Nice and Constantinople to form a creed, which, while it embraced the very essence of the gospel, should, at the same time, be so strict in its use of terms, as forever to forbid its adoption by any one not orthodox upon the doctrine of the Trinity. The famous *ὁμοούσιον* may be regarded as the single pregnant word, which gave the Nicene symbol its greatest significance, and stamped it with the most enduring worth.

The theological mind has not, on the essential points, gone beyond the results reached in the Council of Nice, in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. After this council new questions arose respecting the nature of Christ. He was Divine: he was human. The question of these two natures, the facts and mode of their coexistence, was the question agitated between the Councils of Nice and Chalcedon, A. D., 451, which latter council, finally, as far as it could be done by human wisdom and in human language, decided the question. Here it was affirmed, as Neander says, "that the one Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, should be recognised in two natures, so that all confusion, change and division of the two natures are excluded."

This brief statement respecting the Chalcedon decree will serve to introduce to our notice the third universal creed of the Christian Church, viz.: the "Athanasian," or as it is otherwise called, the "Symbolum Quicunque," so-called because its first word in the original or Latin form is "Quicunque." Although this symbol bears the name of Athanasius, yet there are the strongest reasons for believing that he was not its author; its authorship and age it is now impossible

to determine. It probably received its name from the unison of its doctrines with those taught by Athanasius, just as the Apostles' Creed, though the work of the post-apostolic age, was called by their name. This creed embodies the substance of previous symbols. It embraces the trinitarianism of the Nicene Creed, in a more elaborate and careful form, and the christology of the Chalcedon decisions.

No creeds have been so universally accepted as these three. Others have supplemented them, as new necessities, and change of circumstances, have required; but none have been more discriminating and authoritative.

Of creeds, framed since the Reformation, there is not need to speak, further than to refer to that which has become the common symbol of all branches of the Presbyterian family, the "Westminster Confession," the history and contents of which are familiar to all readers of this article.

4. *The Value of Creeds.*

Creeds are very decidedly objected to by some persons, and they are spoken of, by those who oppose them, in terms certainly not less denunciatory than those in which heretics have sometimes been anathematized by the orthodox. Dr. Channing speaks of his "aversion to creeds;" he calls them, the "means of fastening chains on men's minds;" he looks on "human creeds with feelings approaching contempt;" he commiserates those who "wear the chains of creeds." In his view, those mysteries, "which give a shock to the reason, and seem to contradict some acknowledged truth," "are the staples of creeds." Or, to sum up all in one sentence, he affirms: "Christianity, as set forth in creeds, is a propounder of dark sayings, of riddles, of knotty propositions, of apparent contradictions." These certainly are grave charges; and our work could not be considered thoroughly done, if we omitted to speak of the value of creeds.

We have already seen, that, in the first centuries of the Christian Church, the creeds were of a simple historical character; and the reason assigned for this fact is, that the

glowing piety of the early church made further articles unnecessary. What need to the early Christians of a formal creed-statement of the doctrine of the Trinity? The Christian heart received the doctrine; the believer worshipped Jesus, as "very God," and there was no need, either for himself or any one, that the doctrine should be drawn out in fuller statements. But while, in the best condition of the church, there is felt to be no necessity of a technical creed, it is also found that, in the worst condition of the church, a creed will not be tolerated. A warm Christian heart does not need a creed, a cold and likeless religionism will not have a creed. The creed is too exact in its statements to find favor with a heresiarch. His condemnation is pronounced by it in every line. The Apostles' Creed was not obnoxious to such men as Arius and Sabellius, who, though essentially heterodox in their belief, were yet able, on account of the simple language of that symbol, to interpret it according to their own erroneous views. While, therefore, in the earliest periods of the church, we behold a glowing piety perfectly able to dispense with a more definite creed, we now find those, who, while they may profess the minor moral virtues, are yet destitute of vital piety, and loudest in the cry, "away with creeds." The value of the creed, then is found in its ability to define error and bring it to light. There is a distinction between belief and unbelief. The church should embrace only those who hold to the faith. The church, which used only the Apostles' Creed, found that it was not sufficient to exclude error. No sooner was the Nicene symbol framed and adopted as the embodiment of the Scripture data relative to the profound and confessedly mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, than Arius and all his disciples were forever excluded from the pale of orthodoxy. And there is no other method of maintaining the purity of the church. Arius, with all his errors, claiming to receive both the Bible and the Apostles' Creed, was still within the church, until a more careful and guarded statement of the doctrine of the church

finally excluded him. The Nicene Council were brought face to face with the question, whether, for the sake of retaining all their numbers, whether for the sake of peace, they should retain error in the church, or frame a symbol, which in express terms should forever condemn it. To this day, the church prizes the Nicene Creed, because it has ever proved its value in the condemnation of heresy.

The value of creeds appears, again, in their tendency to unify the faith of the church. It is claimed, by some, that there is no greater unity among us than prevails, e. g., in the "Broad Church." It need not be denied that there is less of unity than were desirable; one reason for which is found, doubtless, in the fact that the church is not instructed in the creed as it should be. But it is obvious to every mind, that the very presence of the creed, standing as it does, at least as a theoretical barrier to false doctrine, can not fail to exert a unifying influence upon the church. Whether we will or not, it stands as a bond of union between believers. Those are more likely to be one in faith, who have in their homes, and often hear and read the words, "We believe in the Triune God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost," than are those who have no fixed formula of belief, and are left to believe one thing or another, as some spiritual guide, or as their own caprice, may dictate.

In still further proof of the value of creeds, we may refer to their influence in the past history of the church. The Papal church, is in its Soteriology, grossly, and in its Anthro-pology, largely deficient; but on the doctrine of the Trinity, very much through the influence of the Nicene Creed, it is orthodox to the present day. Is it too much to believe, that, if the results arrived at in the later centuries in the discussion upon those important themes, had been embodied in a permanent creed at an early day, and extensively diffused throughout the church, the Papal church might have been saved from some of the errors which now so nearly destroy its character as a Church of Christ?

It is this ability of the creed thus to stand as an epitome of Scripture teachings, so carefully to define the truth as to exclude error from whatever source, to serve as a standard to which all who hold the truth may rally, and as an anchor to which all in danger of drifting upon the shoals of unbelief may fasten, which gives it its great and lasting value.

We come now to consider that point, which, in the writer's mind, has most of practical interest in all this discussion upon creeds, viz :

5. *Their proper limits for their present use in our Churches.*

And here the discussion must lose its general character, as it is our intention to speak with exclusive reference to our own denomination. It will be our endeavor to show, if possible, what the law of Presbyterianism requires ; whence, if any where, departures from that law have arisen ; why, if at all, we should not return to the strict letter of that law ; and to conclude with some suggestions concerning the most desirable form of church-creeds, in the present day, if they are to be retained, and the only feasible manner, as appears to the writer, in which that form may be attained.

In most of our Presbyterian churches, (N. S.) persons of every age and class are received into the communion of the church, only on their assent to certain prescribed "Articles of Faith," and entering into covenant with the church. To every one familiar with our standards, it is evident that this is a practice not contemplated by the fathers of the church. The "Directory for Worship," (ch. ix.,) prescribes the manner of the "Admission of Persons to Sealing Ordinances." The first and third sections convey the rules for receiving baptized children to these ordinances. The first section, after carefully appointing the manner of the child's Christian education, by which he is supposed to have been fitted, by the grace of God, for all the privileges of full communion, concludes : "when they (baptized children) come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have a sufficient knowledge to discern the

Lord's body, they ought to be informed, it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's Supper." And to guard against all mistake or error, and to keep the church free from unworthy members, in full communion, the third section provides, that before they are "admitted to sealing ordinances," they "shall be examined as to their knowledge and piety." If this examination prove satisfactory to the Session, there remains for them but the plain and simple duty to "inform" these persons, that they have a new "duty" and a new "privilege," viz.: to sit down at the Table of the Lord. They are recognized as already in the church. "A particular church," says the Form of Government, (ch. ii, § 4,) "consists of a number of professing Christians with their offspring." "All baptized persons, (Discipline, ch. i, § 6,) are members of the church." In accordance with these quotations, it is affirmed to be unpresbyterian, to require any baptized child to assent to Articles of Faith. The mode of his admission to the full communion of the church is plainly prescribed, and no such articles are sanctioned.

In respect to person previously unbaptized, the rule is slightly different. The fourth section, in ch. ix, of the "Directory," prescribes that they shall undergo a similar examination, "with respect to their knowledge and piety," and afterwards they shall "make a public profession of their faith in the presence of the congregation." The most that can be said in respect to this language is, that it might allow Articles of Faith to be used, for the unbaptized alone, if the session so prescribe. In full accordance with this view, the General Assembly of 1865, (Minutes, 1865, page 23,) holds this language: "It is well, however, to remember, that the Confession of Faith and Covenants in use among local churches * * * are * * * not essential to the organization of a church, or the establishment of membership therein, since they are not the authoritative standard of faith or practice in the Presbyterian Church." In the same spirit, the General Assembly of 1831, in a paper on the organization of new congregations

provides for the reception of those who bring letters from other churches, and then for the admission "to a profession of faith of such persons as may offer themselves;" but no mention is made of their assenting to Articles of Faith, (New Digest, page 36). The only recognition of the admissibility of such articles, which has come under the writer's notice, in the standards of our church, is in the action of the Assembly of 1837, in a "Testimony against certain Disorders and Irregularities," one of which is declared to be, "the formation of a great multitude and variety of creeds," after describing which, as "needless" and often harmful, the Assembly concludes: "it being understood, that we do not object to the use of a brief abstract of the doctrines of our Confession of Faith, in the public reception of private members to the church," (Digest, page 312,) which seems much like acting on the principle, "what can't be cured, must be endured." The custom of employing these confessions was then widely prevalent, and the Assembly, perhaps, wisely judged, that greater evils would arise from an effort at their violent expulsion than from allowing them to remain.

These authorities seem to furnish conclusive evidence, that the law of Presbyterianism not only does not require, but does not even contemplate, the use of confessions of faith by the individual church. The very silence of the standards with reference to their use, coupled with the express provision for the officers of the church to adopt the full confession, plainly favors this view.

A word, perhaps, should be said here respecting the reason why a confession of faith was not deemed essential for the private members of the church. In the first place, very careful provision was made for the training of children, whereby it was secured that they should grow up sound in the faith. And in the second place, all the officers of the church, the Pastor, Elders and Deacons, who are the appointed spiritual guides of the flock, were and are required to signify their adhesion to our elaborate Confession of Faith. Providing

thus for the education of the children, and for the soundness in doctrine of the church teachers, it was believed the orthodoxy of the church was safe.

A question more difficult of solution succeeds. *Whence came* this so wide spread innovation? What influence so potent has arisen, to thrust upon the church a custom which is foreign to its very constitution? Investigations upon this subject, which has been carried on rather over the track of tradition than of history, have led to the following conclusions:

There was formerly a very close relation between Presbyterian and Congregational Churches. Very many of our (N. S.) Presbyterian Churches were founded by congregationalists from the Eastern States. Each Congregational Church, being independent, found it necessary, in self-defence, to frame its own Articles of Faith, as they were without a common standard, received like our confession.

Nothing was more natural, therefore, than for Congregational clergymen, emigrating to Central and Western New York and other parts, when they founded churches of the Presbyterian order, to introduce into these churches confessions of faith similar to those they had used in New England. The wide-spread introduction, as well as the very great diversity of creeds is, in part, at least, accounted for in this way.

From a variety of sources, also, the information has been received, that Dr. Griffin, during his pastorate in Newark, N. J., introduced the innovation of creeds into the churches in that region. A New Englander by birth and education, and a man of decided convictions, it is not strange that with his force of character, and his great influence, and withal his undoubted conviction of the utility of creeds, he should have succeeded in introducing a practice which has, at length, become well nigh universal in our branch of the church.

In evidence of the fact that the use of creeds is an innovation, it may be added, that in the O. S. Church, which has

doubtless preserved a more rigid Presbyterianism than ourselves, the use of such articles is comparatively unknown, "south of the zone affected by the Westward influence of Congregationalism, emanating from New England." They have "no public solemnities connected with the admission of baptized persons to the communion," but simply the prescribed examination and admission by the Session. And for the "profession of faith," which is required of an unbaptized adult, they employ in some of their churches, at least, only the Apostles' Creed.

In the further prosecution of our subject, we now arrive at a question of no little practical interest: *shall we return to the strict letter of Presbyterian Law?* Would it be wise to discard creeds altogether in the reception of members to our churches, and conform strictly to the mode of admission prescribed in the Book? To these questions, those who return an answer in the negative, adduce considerations like the following:

(1.) The change would create excitement and might result in harm. It may be said, in favor of the confessions employed in our churches, that their use is not hurtful; if they remain, the church will not be injured. Quietness, therefore, would demand that they remain.

(2.) The act of admission to the communion should be made a solemn act. It is better that even the baptized children, who, according to the strict letter of our law, are already members of the church, should do some act of their own which shall forever invest their admission to sealing ordinances with a character of solemnity, which shall make them feel that as they come up to "years of discretion," they, by their own public declaration, forever renounce the world, and become known as active members of the visible church. The effect of the solemn, public, personal dedication of one's self to the service of the Lord, as well on the part of the baptized children of the church, as of those previously unbaptized, can not fail to have a beneficial effect upon the person performing the act.

(3.) There remains a yet more important reason, for the retaining of the present usage, even in respect to children "born within the pale of the visible church." The same chapter of the "Directory," which prescribes the manner of their admission to sealing ordinances, prescribes also the manner of their preparation for this important step, in these words: they "are to be taught to read and repeat the Catechism, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to fear God, and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ." In how many families and Sabbath Schools, in the present day, is the Catechism wholly ignored! How many children never read, or even hear of, much less learn, the Apostles' Creed? How few, comparatively, are taught with that patience, constancy and faith which should characterize family instruction, "to abhor sin, to fear God and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ." There is a wide-spread departure from old-time and prescribed modes of Christian education, and it may well be doubted, whether the framers of the Standards, would have insisted on their modes of admission to sealing ordinances, when their modes of instruction were so largely disregarded.

It can not be denied that each of these reasons, but particularly the last, has weight. Instruction in the Catechism and the Apostles' Creed *insured* soundness in the faith. These neglected, it may have become necessary for the church, as a guard against erroneous doctrine, to establish a new standard of admission to the ordinances of the church. The one question for the church to decide is, whether she will suffer the evil of the imperfect Christian education of her children to continue, and along with that, keep creeds as a defence; or whether she will restore the good, old catechetical and primitive methods of education, and thus prepare the way to have done with creeds altogether. This latter plan, which, to the writer's mind, seems the one by far most desirable, can yet be accomplished only by time. Meanwhile, during the continued use of creeds, what shall be

their *form*; and how shall the most desirable form be attained?

One circumstance deserves attention at the outset. The custom of the church respecting the admission of children to sealing ordinances, is very different from what it was twenty-five years ago. The past few years have witnessed many and powerful revivals in our Sabbath Schools, and the churches have come to receive to their communion children of very tender age. All the children are obliged to assent to the creed, equally with those of more advanced years. But no child can understand one-fourth part of the language of the Articles of Faith usually employed in our churches.

Also, the language of these creeds is not such as is adapted to the common class of mind. They are drawn up, for the most part, if not wholly, by clergymen who have studied the great doctrines of the gospel, not in the simple language of the Scripture only, but in the technical language which has been employed by theologians, and which they have been compelled to employ, as we have seen, by the heresies which have arisen within the church. The creeds, therefore, which are now employed are, to a great extent, technical, scientific, abstract, elaborate, far, very far, beyond the comprehension of children and youth, if not, also, of adults. These words will not be understood as a plea for a creed level to every comprehension: no creed can be such, for every one must embrace somewhat of the "mystery of godliness;" but, what is pleaded for is a creed which shall be more simple, more brief and more purely scriptural in its language. It were better for us to return, in some degree, to the custom of the primitive church. According to that, the admission of adults to the church was accomplished by the assent of the candidate to certain facts of religion. This confession was brief, simple, scriptural, combining the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Deity of Christ, and his mediatorial Person and Work. At an early day, the Apostles' Creed became the customary

formula for the instruction of catechumens, and for their confession at baptism and union with the church.

At the same time, these creeds should be sufficiently strict, so as not to admit error. Not one word is here spoken in favor of any latitudinarianism. No one could abhor, more than the writer, a symbol which could be used as well by the "Broad Church" as by the orthodox. But in respect to this idea, it may be said that the lines between truth and error are now more distinctly drawn than in the days of the Nicene controversy. No Arian would now seek to thrust himself within an Orthodox communion; he finds his natural, his congenial home, within the precincts of a church "broad" enough to embrace every form of error the world has ever known, so only it be coupled with a correct outward life. There is not, therefore, the same necessity upon us, especially the individual churches, for retaining a technical symbol, which the Council of Nice had for forming one. If our creeds could be simplified, expurgated of theological terms, abbreviated, scripturalized, they would, without doubt, retain all their present excellencies, while they would be relieved of many defects.

On the supposition, then, that creeds are, for a time at least, to remain in our churches, on whom shall the labor devolve of preparing one suitable for general use? At the present time, individual persons and individual churches, have undertaken the labor for themselves, and endless confusion has been the result. Some Presbyteries have assumed to provide their churches with a uniform creed, but the confusion is scarcely diminished. To extricate the church from this confusion, but two courses are possible.

We must either abolish creeds altogether, or if they are to remain, *the General Assembly should provide the churches with a uniform creed for the reception of all members to the church.*

An effort was made in this direction a few years ago, which for some reason failed. There is no reason why it should

fail. Let the Assembly appoint a Committee of the representative men of the church, of some diversity of age and temperament, let a symbol be prepared, discussed, even for two or three years, in successive assemblies if necessary, let it be thus revised, improved, perfected and finally adopted by the Assembly. Thence let it be sent down to the Presbyteries, with the strong indorsement of the highest judicatory of our church, and with the earnest recommendation that it be adopted by every presbytery as the uniform standard for all its churches. Would not the result be one we might all hail with joy?

It is evident too, that the church, through its General Assembly, has this power. In the "Form of Government," (ch. i, § 2,) it is affirmed, that "every Christian Church, or union or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government, which Christ hath appointed." Let General Assembly prescribe the qualifications requisite for all the members of our churches, by sending forth a uniform standard of belief, and it will have done a good work for the church. Many churches and many of our older pastors feel the need, at the present time, of creeds, very different from those they now employ, and yet they shrink from adding a single new symbol to those, so numberless, already in existence.

This part of the discussion may therefore properly terminate, with the expression of a conviction, that the creeds, on which believers are admitted to the communion of the church, should be more simple, more brief, more scriptural in their terminology; and that the General Assembly of our Church should be petitioned to provide the churches with a uniform and abbreviated symbol.

The writer cannot lay aside his pen, without expressing the wish, that the thoughts herein embodied may awaken

other minds in the same direction, may stimulate abler pens to the discussion of the theme, and may result in combining the wisdom of the Church in the production of a creed, in the adoption of which all portions of the Church may heartily unite.

ART. VI.—PRESBYTERIAN REUNION.

Thirty years ago the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America was divided. The rupture was preceded by violent ecclesiastical agitations, and bitter doctrinal controversies. A new generation has since grown up, and a new and calmer spirit pervades our churches. By a sure instinct they have been coming nearer together. The question about voluntary societies has become insignificant; the doctrinal differences are fading away; the Plan of Union is well nigh obsolete; slavery is abolished throughout the land, by a higher than ecclesiastical authority; the Southern Presbyterian churches of both Schools are together, and by themselves, and likely to remain so for some time. The whole of the new generation of ministers, and the great body of the laity, in both branches of the church, see no sufficient reason for continuing a division, which weakens and embarrasses us at many points, which is a reproach to our Christianity, and an incubus upon our proper Christian work. We have the same standards of doctrine and polity; we are distinguished by identical family characteristics from the other denominations around us; we are living and working for the same ends, in the same towns and villages across the broad central belt of our common country; we are planting our missionary and feeble churches side by side in our new states and territories, and so wasting our strength. Why, then, should we stay longer asunder?

Wise and good men have been asking this question for the

last ten years ; and the time has now come when it must be answered. Before God and our consciences, acting in the name of the Great Head of the Church, and under the most solemn sense of our responsibility to Him and to his Church, we are summoned to answer this question, on which so much depends. No more momentous ecclesiastical decision is now pending. Personal and partisan considerations are as the small dust in the balance. And we are to answer it in view of the present and the future, rather than of the past. The stress is not on what we may have been, but on what we now are, and what we are to be. Each side may honor for their services the men who bore aloft its banner in the contests of the past generation ; each may still claim that itself was then all right, and the other party all wrong ; but that it is not the question now before us. We have a present duty to perform ; and the past may be to us quite as much a warning as an example. He who reads the present only by the lights and shades of the past can not act wisely for the future. And we are in fact deciding rather for our posterity than for ourselves. Those who oppose reunion assume, then, a most serious responsibility. He who, at such a juncture, wrongly accuses brethren of heresy, that he may get an argument for continuance in schism, incurs a double guilt. He defames, that he may keep asunder.

The Presbyterian Churches, commonly called Old and New School, exchanged delegates for the first time in 1863, at Philadelphia, where the New School was in session, and at Peoria, where the Old School met. A thrill of joy swept through the churches, when these cordial and fraternal greetings were swiftly and widely diffused. The *Princeton Review* then said : "Every Christian must rejoice in the spirit manifested in both the venerable bodies, which have thus auspiciously inaugurated the measures which contemplate the ultimate reunion of the great churches which they represent All the causes [which led to the separation] are gradually ceasing to exist." All felt what was coming. The prog-

ress of the war drew our churches together. The Old School, became, as a whole, as loyal, and as outspoken on the subject of slavery, as the New School. Their extreme Border State men were driven to the wall. Matters advanced so rapidly that, in 1866, large and able committees were appointed by both Assemblies, to consider the terms of reünion. After repeated, prayerful and encouraging conferences, they agreed, with most unexpected unanimity, upon a joint Report. This Report is able, candid, acute and conciliatory. It is a noble basis, possibly with some slight modifications, for a magnanimous, cordial and permanent reünion. The fact that our admirable committees were able, after a prolonged, sharp and yet most courteous discussion, to agree on this document, is an indication and presage of what we hold to be the fact about our two churches,—that they are already one in fact, in heart and mind, and only need to come together, and talk with each other in a Christian mood, in order to arrive at the same unanimity (with some stern exceptions), which characterised the deliberations and results of the joint committees. Their Report covers all the grounds of difference, and is as follows :

PROPOSED TERMS OF REÜNION BETWEEN THE TWO BRANCHES OF
THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Joint Committee of the two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, appointed for the purpose of conferring on the desirableness and practicability of uniting these two bodies, deeply impressed with the responsibility of the work assigned us, and having earnestly sought Divine guidance, and patiently devoted ourselves to the investigation of the questions involved, agree in presenting the following for the consideration, and, if they see fit, for the adoption, of the two General Assemblies :

Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by healing our divisions ; that practical union would greatly augment the efficiency of the whole

Church for the accomplishment of its divinely-appointed work ; that the main causes producing division have either wholly passed away, or become in a great degree inoperative ; and that two bodies, bearing the same name, adopting the same Constitution, and claiming the same corporate rights, can not be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate and, in some respects, rival organizations ; and regarding it as both just and proper that a Reunion should be effected by the two Churches, as independent bodies and on equal terms ; we propose the following terms and recommendations, as suited to meet the demands of the case :

1. The Reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards ; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures ;" and its fair, historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies in opposition to Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, and to Arminianism and Pelagianism on the other, shall be regarded as the sense in which it is received and adopted ; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall continue to be approved as containing the principles and rule of our polity.

2. All the ministers and churches embraced in the two bodies shall be admitted to the same standing in the united body which they may hold in their respective connections up to the consummation of the Union ; and all the churches connected with the united body, not thoroughly Presbyterian in their organization, shall be advised to perfect their organization as soon as is permitted by the highest interests to be consulted ; no other shall be chosen Commissioners to the General Assembly as are eligible according to the Constitution of the Church.

3. The boundaries of the several Presbyteries and Synods,

shall be adjusted by the General Assembly of the united Church.

4. The official records of the two Branches of the Church for the period of separation shall be preserved and held as making up the one history of the Church, and no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both the bodies shall be of any authority until reestablished in the united body.

5. The corporate right, now held by the two General Assemblies and by their Boards and Committees, shall, as far as practicable, be consolidated and applied for their several objects as defined by law.

6. There shall be one set of Committees or Boards for Home and Foreign Missions, and the other religious enterprises of the Church, which the churches shall be encouraged to sustain, though left free to cast their contributions into other channels, if they desire to do so.

7. As soon as practicable after the Union shall be effected, the General Assembly shall reconstruct and consolidate the several Permanent Committees and Boards which now belong to the two Assemblies, in such a manner as to represent, as far as possible, with impartiality, the views and wishes of the two bodies constituting the united Church.

8. When it shall be ascertained that the requisite number of Presbyteries of the two bodies have approved the terms of union as hereinafter provided for, the two General Assemblies shall each appoint a Committee of seven, none of them having an official relation to either the Board or the Committee of Publication, who shall constitute a Joint Committee, whose duty it shall be to revise the Catalogues of the existing publications of the two Churches, and to make out a list from them of such books and tracts as shall be issued by the united Church; and any Catalogue thus made out, in order to its adoption, shall be approved by at least five members of each Committee.

9. If, at any time after the Union has been effected, any of

the Theological Seminaries, under the care and control of the General Assembly, shall desire to put themselves under Synodical control, they shall be permitted to do so at the request of their Boards of direction; and those Seminaries which are independent in their organization shall have no privilege of putting themselves under ecclesiastical control, to the end that, if practicable, a system of ecclesiastical supervision of such Institutions may ultimately prevail through the entire united Church.

10. It shall be regarded as the duty of all our judicatories, ministers, and people in the united Church to study the things which make for peace, and to guard against all needless and offensive references to the causes that have divided us; and, in order to avoid the revival of past issues by the continuance of any usage in either Branch of the Church that has grown out of our former conflicts, it is earnestly recommended to the lower judicatories of the Church, that they conform their practice in relation to all such usages, as far as consistent with their convictions of duty, to the general custom of the Church prior to the controversies that resulted in the separation.

11. The terms of the Reunion shall be of binding force, if they shall be ratified by three-fourths of the Presbyteries connected with each Branch of the Church within one year after they shall have been submitted to them for approval.

12. The terms of the Reunion shall be published by direction of the General Assemblies of 1867, for the deliberate examination of both Branches of the Church, and the Joint Committee shall report to the General Assemblies of 1868 any modification of them they may deem desirable, in view of any new light that may have been received during the year.

13. It is recommended that the Hon. DANIEL HAINES, and the Hon. HENRY W. GREEN, LL.D., of New Jersey, DANIEL LORD, LL.D., and THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL.D., of New York, and Hon. WILLIAM STRONG and Hon. GEO. SHARSWOOD, LL.D., of Pennsylvania, be appointed by the General Assemblies a Committee to investigate all questions of property and of

vested rights, as they may stand related to the matter of Reunion, and this Committee shall report to the Joint Committee as early as the first of January, 1868.

14. It is evident that, in order to adapt our ecclesiastical system to the necessities and circumstances of the united Church as a greatly enlarged and widely extended body, some changes in the Constitution will be required. The Joint Committee, therefore, request the two General Assemblies to instruct them in regard to the preparation of an additional article on this subject, to be reported to the Assemblies of 1868.

Signed, by order of the Joint Committee,

CHARLES W. BEATTY, Chairman.

EDWIN F. HATFIELD, Secretary.

NEW YORK, May 7th, 1867.

Leaving their Report with the General Assemblies and the ministers and churches of their denomination throughout the land, your Committee can not disregard the Providential auspices under which their recommendations await decision. The present is thought to be a favorable time, now that many questions of former controversy have lost their interest, for adopting a magnanimous policy suited to the necessities of our country and the world. The Presbyterian Church has a history of great renown. It has been intimately associated with civil and religious liberty in both hemispheres. Its republican and representative character, the parity of its clergy, the simplicity of its order, the equity of its administration, its sympathy with our institutions, its ardent patriotism in all stages of our history, its flexible adaptation to our heterogeneous population, its liberal support of schools, colleges, and seminaries designed for general education and theological culture, its firm and steadfast faith in the extension of the Redeemer's Kingdom, and that by means of revealed truth and the special effusions of the Holy Spirit in distinction from all trust in human arts and devices, all unite to promise, if we are wise and faithful, a future for the Presbyterian Church in

these United States greater and better than all the past. Amid the changes which have occurred around us, we are confident that nothing true and good will ever recede or decay; and it becomes all those who love the faith, order, and worship, abounding in love and hope, to pray that God would count them worthy of their calling, that they may fulfill all the good pleasure of His goodness and the work of faith with power, that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in them, and they in Him, according to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Signed, by order of the Committee,

WILLIAM ADAMS, Chairman.

NEW YORK, May 7th, 1867.

In the Old School Assembly, which met last May at Cincinnati, this Report was referred to a Special Committee, a majority of whom brought in a series of resolutions, adopted by a nearly unanimous vote, the most important of which are the first, which "recognizes in the unanimity of the Joint Committee the finger of God as pointing toward an early and cordial reunion of the two sister churches now so long separated"; and the seventh, which declares that "the Assembly is not called upon to express either approbation or disapprobation of the terms of reunion presented by the Committee in its details." This Assembly also declined to instruct the Joint Committee to bring in an article on the "changes in the Constitution" that may be required after reunion. The minority of the Special Committee in that Assembly brought in a Report, asking that their Committee on Reunion be instructed to obtain, 1. A more definite statement of the doctrinal basis; 2. An exclusion of "Committee-men" (as under the Plan of Union) from the church courts; and, 3. An express recognition of the right and duty of each Presbytery to be satisfied of the soundness of every minister it receives. After a close debate, these resolutions were rejected by the decisive vote of 152 to 64.

The New School Assembly, at Rochester, adopted the Re-

port of the Joint Committee with entire unanimity, including the fourteenth article on "the changes in the Constitution." They say "that results have already been reached full of promise and hope; that, whatever concessions have been made, they only indicate how near the two parts of the divided Church have approached each other; that nothing more and nothing less than Christian charity would dictate has been yielded; and that, in the adjustment of any difficulties or differences, a proper regard has been preserved for the honor and rights of the respective bodies." And they add, that the Report as adopted still "leaves the General Assemblies of 1868 free to act with reference to these terms of Reunion, in whole or in part, as providential signs may indicate; and, if advisable, to submit them to the constitutional and final action of the Presbyteries. Ample opportunity is thus afforded for a full and deliberate consideration of the whole subject, in all its bearings, as they shall affect local interests or the well-being of the entire Church."

It was, of course, to be expected that so momentous a Report would be closely scrutinized. The Joint Committee invite suggestions, from both friends and opponents, on all the proposed articles of agreement. Every sentence and clause should be scanned. Each side ought to be convinced that the other, as well as itself, is prepared for reunion. This can, indeed, be fully determined only by the final votes in the Assemblies and Presbyteries, but testimony from all quarters may, in the meanwhile, indicate the mind of the church. The Presbyteries are already taking up the matter. Our religious journals, on both sides, are debating it somewhat warmly. This is as it should be; for it is better for us not to press immediate reunion, if we are to come together only for strife and debate. Let us have the debate first, that when we "meet to part no more" it may be only with peace and thankfulness.

At the same time, in such a preliminary discussion, it is all-important that we should be candid and set down naught in

malice. We are bound by the most solemn considerations to judge each others' position and words in the most charitable manner. Each must, to some extent, take the other's testimony about itself. Neither should impute to the other what that other expressly disavows: for when this is done, and persisted in, all possible basis for reünion is gone. The moral tie of all reünion is mutual confidence. More than this is indeed needed, but this is vital.

And our religious newspapers, on both sides, it must be confessed, have, with slight exceptions, thus far conducted the discussion in a good spirit, trying to bring out the real facts of the case. Dr. Monfort, of Cincinnati, a member of the Joint Committee, has gone into the subject, in the *Presbyter*, with the most fulness and ability. *The Banner*, of Pittsburg, has done good service; and *The Presbyterian*, of Philadelphia, though not fully decided, has been entirely fair. The New School journals have all favored the Report. The general tone of discussion was manly and conciliatory, until the publication of an article in the *Princeton Review*, in July, giving an account of the last Assembly. Everybody knew that that *Review* would oppose reünion. Ever since the division, which it at first opposed, it has been uncompromising toward the New School. It has, recently, been fond of the conceit of likening us to "secessionists" and "rebels," and the Old School to the loyal nation. Two years ago, it advocated the reädmission of the seceded Southern churches, with all the guilt of secession in both state and church upon them, back to the fellowship of the Northern church, without any conditions; while it insisted, at the same time, that the New School should be reädmitted only on condition of repenting of sins it was not committing, and recanting heresies it had always repudiated. So that, unless it had experienced a remarkable change, all knew that its opposition to reünion would be an inevitable part of the programme. Progress, in this world, is through antagonisms; and here was the antagonism in our progress to reünion. But, in spite of all the experience of the past, we did not really

anticipate just that style of opposition which these last tactics have developed. We had supposed that some feeble rays of the general spirit of conciliation and courtesy, which is pervading our churches, might have been reflected from this mirror; but it seems that it is a mirror which reflects only past feuds and not present harmonies. In all the heat of the fierce controversies, thirty years ago, no more reckless or distorted representations of the New School positions were ever penned than have just appeared in the *Princeton Review*. We say this deliberately, for we must say it. We owe it to ourselves not to be silent under such imputations. Principles are ascribed to us which we have uniformly disavowed, and doctrines we have never cherished. If the New School and the Old School be as here represented, all talk about reünion is a waste of breath; for the *Review* knows that we deny these charges, and yet reiterates them, as if its dictum were infallible against our disclaimer: how, then, can we ever come to terms? In discussing the points here made, we mean to use great plainness of speech, following the example set us by the *Review*; but even in doing this, we trust that we may be kept from ascribing to the other side what it would indignantly reject as a calumny. We shall also discuss these points in a strictly impersonal way, taking the *Princeton Review* as the representative of certain opinions and prejudices. Men are of comparatively slight account in such a debate.

The whole tone of its discussion is that of an argument for a foregone conclusion; it is not an inquiry, but an indictment and a judgment. It is the spirit of an advocate, intent at all hazards in making out his case. The thesis is, that reünion is now impossible; this is "demonstrated" by divers dicta. It is not an inquiry whether the New School be heretical, but the point-blank assertion that it does foster heresy. It does not attempt to prove that we subscribe to the Confession in an "immoral" way, but it roundly declares that we allow it to be done. Reünion was rapidly advancing. Both Assemblies encouraged it. It must be blocked if possible. A strong

assault must be made at once on the advancing lines. The danger is so imminent, that there is hardly time for argument; it is dictation and authority. The faithful are told that the ark is in danger; that all they hold dear is on the verge of ruin; that more than half of their own number have already struck their arms and capitulated, and must be brought back, or else the heresies and immoral principles of the New School will speedily overwhelm them. All of which is just in place in the midst of negotiations for peace, in the course of which the Old School Assembly solemnly enjoins on all its churches and ministers "to cherish fraternal feelings, to cultivate Christian intercourse . . . and to avoid all needless controversies and competitions adapted to perpetuate division and strife." (Minutes, 1866.) And so the *Princeton Review*, to honor its own Assembly, rakes up old charges against us, in the most exaggerated and embittered form. This, to say the least, is a novel way of promoting "fraternal feelings." It may come back to plague the inventor.

The *Princeton Review* seems to be quite oblivious of the great changes which have come over both "schools" since the acts of excision. Some of these are patent to all who have eyes and are willing to see; others are more hidden and subtle, but not the less real, though they may not be so readily put into formulas. Among the former are the notorious facts, that the New School is thoroughly organized as a Presbyterian body, having renounced the vain attempt to combine incongruous elements in its system of church order, and no longer favoring even the vestiges of the Plan of Union for any future churches; that it is not strenuous as to the support of voluntary societies; that it is separated in all church action from Congregationalism; that many of its more extreme men have willingly gone into other church connections; that certain objectionable forms of doctrine and of practice are no more taught in its pulpits and seminaries; that it, in short, has become a homogeneous body, on the basis of the standards of the Presbyterian church; and that, especially in case of

reunion, all these tendencies will be accelerated and carried to their completion. In the Old School, too, there is, if we mistake not, less disposition to insist on the mere technicalities of systematic theology; a position harmonious with ours on the subject of human rights and bondage; a greater willingness to hear and credit our testimony about ourselves; a desire, in short, to look at the points of agreement rather than at the differences; and an increasing disposition, while clinging to the essentials, to let the non-essentials adjust themselves. In social, political, ecclesiastical and even doctrinal matters, we can no longer draw our lines outside of both schools. There are Old School men in New School churches, and New School in the Old, and they are liked in both. The distinction of New England and Scotch-Irish belongs to the past. Nine-tenths of our laymen do not know the points of difference; and two-thirds of our ministers do not mind them. They are discussed in our seminaries, but not much in our pulpits. True, if certain phrases be started, as imputation, inability and limited atonement, some ears at once become erect, and neither extreme can quite see through the definitions and philosophy of the other; but the disputation is generally adjourned, *nemine contradicente*; and the disputants go into their pulpits and preach the same grand, old doctrines of our Reformed Confession, the same "system of doctrine" in its fitting terms; and the people hear them gladly, and sinners are converted and saints built up in the immemorial faith of the Church of our Redeemer. This is about the fair state of the case now in both branches of the Presbyterian church. Strong, subtle, unseen, divine influences are drawing them nearer and closer—even to each others' hearts. The breath of a new and better life is wafted over us from above. We feel and know its serene energy. It comes from the deepest instincts of the Christian heart. Day by day it is gathering nutriment and vigor, and struggling to put on its full and radiant form of harmony and beauty. It is a partial fulfilment of our Lord's intercessory prayer, that they all may

be one! It is the voice of the Spirit to our churches. They who fight against it know not what they do.

The first specific point made by the *Princeton Review* shows its animus, viz.: that the Reunion of the churches "concerns the very existence" of the Old School Church; that the Report calls upon them "to renounce that in which our special identity consists;" "that the historical reality known and revered as the Old School Presbyterian Church will cease to exist," and, therefore, "with the opponents of the proposed union, it is a matter of conscience," while with its advocates it is only "a matter of expediency, or, at most, of sentiment." (pp. 502-3.) Is it not rather an assumption, that the advocates of reunion, both Old School and New School, have no "conscience" in the matter, but are only controlled by "expediency" or "sentiment"? Who gave anybody a monopoly of conscience in this debate? The argument, too, is fallacious. If it has any force, it is an estoppel on all possible projects for reunion. If the Old School is bound in conscience not to renounce its "identity" as Old School, of course there can be no reunion, but only absorption. Reunion implies, that it is willing to put off "this fond and false identity," and "woo and clasp" a better mode of being. A bachelor cannot remain a bachelor and get married too. And how long has this Old School "identity" been in existence? Just as long as the New School, and no longer. If the two are reunited, their separate identity, of course, is lost. But this identity consists, in each case, chiefly in its antagonism to the other. What will be lost is this antagonism, and nothing more. The reunited body will have the same Confession and Catechisms and Government and Representation; only the presbyteries will send Commissioners to one Assembly instead of two. The proper Presbyterian identity will remain unchanged. It may, indeed, be said, that it is best to have just such a separate body as the Old School, forever apart from all others, as a standing memorial of certain peculiar views and principles. But a church is not merely a monument: the Greek Church

called itself "orthodox" and became stagnant. Can not something be conceived more perfect than even the Old School Presbyterian Church just as it now is? Would it not be a good thing to have a church both conservative and progressive, liberal while true to the faith, storing the wealth of the past and, also, provident for the wants of the future, cordially accepting its historic symbols while recognizing infallibility only in the Divine Word, combining and adjusting all the diverse elements, by whose perpetual inter-action the highest forms of life are engendered? We would rather be in a church which contained both Calvin and Edwards, both Alexander and Richards, than in one which had only one of these; and we would not stay in a church which would cast out any one of them.

The *Princeton Review* further asserts, that in the proposed plan of reünion everything has been sacrificed by the Old School to the New; that the Old School members of the Joint Committee, and two thirds of the last O. S. Assembly, and all Old School men who advocate this plan, have "surrendered at discretion," and given up all the principles which distinguish that venerable body. The acceptance of this plan, it says, would involve "a great moral wrong." It spares neither friend nor foe; all that do not agree with it have slight claims to conscience, or orthodoxy, or faithful adherence to the standards. This sweeping charge, now, has in it a fallacious semblance of truth, while it is essentially untrue. Of course, in all questions between two parties about reüniting on fair and equal terms, the stricter party will always seem to yield the most for the sake of peace; it is in its very province and position, that it appears to exercise the grace of magnanimity more conspicuously. It is essential to reünion, that there be some concessions in deference to each others' rights; and such benignity would be most significant where it was most required. If the *Princeton Review* would only once speak out fairly and kindly about the New School, we have no doubt it would seem to have "surrendered at discretion" all

that it has been so long fighting for ; but it might none the less be a hopeful sign.—Taking Old School and New School, however, as they were thirty years ago, and as they now are, it can not by any means be said that in the proposed plan the New School has made no concessions. It says nothing about the excising act, though it still thinks it unconstitutional ; in all that concerns Presbyterian order and organization, and affiliation with outside bodies, it concedes everything ; it gives in a more unreserved adhesion to our symbols, with entire unanimity, than it could then have done ; it gives up its distinctive committees and organizations, built up entirely by its own energy ; in respect to the churches formed on the Plan of Union, and to Seminaries, it is willing to do all that it can in consistency with the rights of others ; it takes the place of a minority, when all its own schemes and operations are vigorous and growing ; if it looked chiefly to personal and denominational ends, it would be wiser for it to remain separate.—But, after all, have we not grown so near together, that neither really, under this plan, “surrenders” ought to the other ? Is there much of a sacrifice on either side ? What is sacrificed, what is not gained, if both are really willing to receive the same old standards in the same spirit ?—As to the Old School men, so far as appears, a very large majority of the Old School itself, who are accused by the *Review* of giving up all their distinctive principles,—they probably know what they are about and are well able to defend themselves. They comprise some of the most honored names in the Presbyterian Church of this country, far above the reach of wholesale accusations. But it certainly is a curious, if not entertaining spectacle, to have on one side nearly all of the best Committee that could be found in the Old School, and more than two-thirds of its last Assembly, and most of its laymen, agreeing to a carefully proposed plan,—and then to have its only quarterly *Review* announce in magisterial terms, that they have all gone over to the enemy, and prophesy that this plan thus sanctioned, will “be nearly unanimously rejected by our

branch of the church." It must be very cogent arguments that can achieve such a victory; mere dictation will not be likely to do it.

We come, now, to the special objections made to the Plan and to the New School:

1. The first count in the indictment is upon the interpretation of what is commonly called "the terms of subscription," or, more properly, the form of assent, to our Confession of Faith. Our ministers, ruling elders and deacons are required to receive this Confession "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." This is the whole of the formula; and the question is upon its interpretation. The *Princeton Review* rightly considers this as a vital point, involving the personal honor and honesty of our ministry; and it ought, therefore, to make no charges which cannot be proved. If it accuses us of holding an "immoral" principle, and the accusation is not sustained, it is itself liable to the counter charge of wilful defamation; and its own unproved accusation against us is the proof of its guilt.

It says, that we hold to "a latitudinarian principle of subscription," which "allows men to adopt our system, who notoriously do not adopt it;" that this is "a revival of the famous doctrine of the Oxford Tract No. 90, which asserted the propriety of signing a creed in a 'non-natural' sense;" and further (pp. 505-6), that "*this is the very principle which constitutes the sum and substance of the Plan of Union proposed in the Report of the Joint Committee of fifteen.*" That is, not only does the New School adopt this vicious and dishonest principle, but it is also sanctioned by the Old School Joint Committee, and by all in both schools who advocate the adoption of the Report. All these have been given over to blindness of mind on this clear question.

Against this, we take the open ground, that the New School has never sanctioned, directly or indirectly, but, on the contrary, has uniformly repudiated the principle here ascribed to it; still further, that it holds to the principle of subscription

now advocated by the *Princeton Review*, so that there is no ground of difference on this point between the two schools; and, that the Report of the Committee is so far from adopting the lax principle of subscription, that it is wholly inconsistent with it.

There are three ways, says the *Review*, in which the form of assent has been interpreted: 1. As signifying the adoption "of every proposition" in the Confession; 2. As meaning just what the words say, that "the system of doctrine" contained in the Confession, that is, the Calvinistic or Reformed system, is adopted; 3. That by "system of doctrine" is here meant "the essential doctrines of Christianity and nothing more." The first it rejects; the second it defends; the third it ascribes to the New School and to the Committee's Report. We also reject the first, accept the second, and repudiate the third: this is the New School view, and there is no proper evidence to the contrary. The *Princeton Review* has foisted upon us a theory we have never espoused; and done this to rouse the conscience of Old School men and to prevent reunion. Does the end justify the means?

During its long and consistent career that *Review* has discussed the question of subscription at various times, with different degrees of precision. In its third volume, October, 1831, it equally opposed two extremes—that latitude, which embraces only "the great fundamental doctrines of the gospel, as they are recognized by all evangelical denominations"; and that strictness which "precludes all diversity in the manner of receiving and explaining the doctrines" of the Confession. The "profession to adopt the system of doctrines," it said, implies, that we "profess to believe the whole series of doctrines which go to make up the Calvinistic system, in opposition to the Socinian, Pelagian, Semi-Pelagian, Arminian, or any other opposite and inconsistent view of Christianity." "The Confession," it stated, "as formed by the Westminster divines, was an acknowledged compromise between two classes of theologians. When adopted by the Presbyterian church in this country it was with the distinct understanding that the

mode of subscription did not imply strict conformity of views.* And much more to the same effect. In this view there was a general agreement. Mr. Barnes, in his Defence before the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, 1835, directly refers to it as expressing his "own views," (pp. 23-25 of his "Defence").

This same *Review*, in July, 1858, said, unqualifiedly, that the Old School Presbyterian Church "could not hold together a week, if we made the adoption of all its [the Confession's] propositions a condition of ministerial fellowship." Being thereupon called to account, it published, in October, 1858, an extended article on the "Adoption of the Confession of Faith," reiterating the same views as in 1831, but adding an exposition and refutation of what it called the New School theory. It classified the theories as 1, "Substance of doctrine;" 2, "Every proposition;" 3, "System of doctrine." The first, it said, was New School and indefinite; the second was extreme and impracticable; the third was the true "via media," and its own view. But the New School at once objected to ascribing to them any such indefinite view as that presented under the title "substance of doctrine." No declaration of the New School as a body, nor of those considered as its representatives, could be, or was, cited in favor of such a loose phrase; and by many New School men it was publicly and definitely denied. We agreed to the "system of doctrine" view, and agreed, also, in condemning the "every proposition theory," as inconsistent with the plain terms of the Adopting Act, and with the uniform practice of the Presbyterian church. In respect to this last, the *ipsissima verba* theory, viz.: that we receive "*every proposition*" contained in the Confession, the *Princeton Review* said, and still says, that "it is contrary to the plain historical meaning of the words" of assent; that it "is contrary to the mind of the church;" that it is "impracticable, and could not to be carried out without working the certain and immediate ruin of the church;" that it tends to "vitiate" the ministry — for "the over-strict, the world

* Bibl. Repertory, Vol. iii, 521-523.

over, are the least faithful," etc. To all this we heartily agree. We disallow the phrase "substance of doctrine," because it is indefinite, easily misunderstood, and does not suggest the right theory.

That right theory is found in a simple and honest interpretation of the ordination formula, "that we receive the Confession of Faith as containing the *system of doctrine* taught in the Holy Scriptures." This declares that the system of the Confession is the system taught in the Bible. The system of the Confession, as everybody knows, is the Reformed or Calvinistic system, in distinction from the Lutheran, the Arminian, the Antinomian, the Pelagian, and the Roman Catholic. No one can honestly and fairly subscribe the Confession who does not accept the Reformed or Calvinistic system.

This is the plain sense of the Adopting Act of 1729. The Synod there declared its approval of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, "as being in all the *essential and necessary articles*, good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine;" and it further said, that if any minister had "any scruples about any article, he was to declare the same to the Presbytery or Synod," and was still to be admitted, if the scruples were only about "articles not essential and necessary." On the same day, too, the Synod heard "each others' scruples," "agreed to their solution," and formally adopted the Confession on this basis. The Synod of 1736 (Minutes, p. 126) gave a stricter interpretation, saying that the Confession, etc., was, and was to be, adopted "without the least variation or alteration, and without any regard to said *distinctions*;" (i. e., to the distinctions contained in the preliminary act). But we do not see how they could say this, seeing that, as a matter of fact, those distinctions are referred to in the Adopting Act itself, where it says that "scruples" were proposed and a "solution of them" agreed upon. And, if we rightly understand the *Princeton Review*, it could not say that no reference is to be had to such "distinctions," viz. : between

articles essential and non-essential, otherwise its whole argument against the "every proposition" theory topples over.— Again, in 1758, after the first division, the first article of the "Plan of Union" declares, that the Synods of New York and Philadelphia, "having always received and approved the Westminster Confession, etc., as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, we do still receive the same as the Confession of our Faith, strictly enjoining it on all our members and probationers for the ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in said Confession and Catechisms, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto." These are the main facts in the case; and they fully and only sanction the intermediate theory of subscription, viz. : that it is an adoption of the essential and necessary articles of the Confession itself, as containing the Reformed or Calvinistic system of faith.

The last number of the *Princeton Review* goes over substantially the same ground with the article in 1858, but with one significant variation. It expounds the "every proposition" theory, and the "system of doctrine" theory as before; but it now ascribes to the New School another and still looser dalliance with subscription. It says that our view, sanctioned, too, by the Joint Committee, is, that we adopt the Confession as containing "the essential doctrines of Christianity and nothing more." We do not merely adopt it for "substance of doctrine" but have reached a still lower degree of indefiniteness and indifference. We act, it is declared, on a principle which is "immoral," "destructive," "contrary to the very principle on which our church was founded;" which allows us to assent to what we deny, "to reject the system we profess to believe," and which brings in heresies and divisions.

Here is a broad and plain charge, and on it we take a plain and sharp issue. Our Christian honor and integrity are assailed, and we can not let it pass in silence. The charge is false and groundless. There is no evidence for it, either in the records

of our church, or the declarations of our leading representatives. It is a lawless fiction, imputed to us by one who is not our representative.

What is the evidence alleged for it? At the time of the Adopting Act, Presidents Dickinson and Davies, it is said, contended for the position, that the Synod required candidates to adopt the Confession only as to the "articles essential to Christianity." Very well; what if they did? How are we now responsible for these antiquated views unless we advocate and defend them? Has the New School Church, have any of its divines, ever done this?—Dr. Gillett in his able "History of the Presbyterian Church," gives a fair account of this matter, saying that the Synod of 1736 adopted a too unqualified interpretation of the form of assent, viz.: that it was to be "without the least variation or alteration, and without any regard to said distinctions," i. e., to the distinctions contained in the preliminary act. Now Dr. Gillett is right in saying, that the Synod of 1736 could not undo what the Synod of 1729 had done; for the latter, as we have seen, had actually adopted the Confession with the distinctions expressed in the preliminary act. If the Synod meant, as the *Princeton Review* says, (p. 516, note,) that these "distinctions" referred only to "what is essential to *Christianity* and what is not," they might have expressed themselves more clearly,—and they would have been correct in saying that the Confession is not to be received on the basis of such a distinction. But they certainly seem to deny that any "distinctions" whatever were made by the Synod of 1729, or could be made; and this is plainly incorrect. For the Adopting Act, and the whole church ever since, including the *Princeton Review*, have made and must make a plain distinction between articles essential to the integrity of the Reformed system and articles not thus essential. But however this may be, Dr. Gillett is speaking as a historian; he gives the facts; he does not say that the New School adopts this theory of "the essentials of Christianity," as their theory of subscription. The *Princeton Re-*

view, however, asserts that the "New School as a church is committed to the "broad-church principle," because our Publication Committee issued Dr. Gillett's book." This is an extraordinary argument. Even if Dr. Gillett had formally, in our name, espoused the theory, which he has not, the church could not thus be committed to it. The *Princeton Review* itself, in speaking of the publications of its own church, (1858, p. 562,) says, "the Board of Publication is *not the Church*, and therefore no *special authority belongs to any of its publications*." It is convenient to have the articles in a *Review* anonymous, for then the contradictions do not seem quite so glaring.

And will it be believed, that this is the only direct evidence, which the *Princeton Review* has to offer in support of its dogmatic position about our principle of subscription? And yet this is the fact of the case. Its indirect proof, from our doctrinal differences, we shall soon consider. But of direct, historical evidence it has nothing at all; no declarations of Assembly, Presbytery or Synod; no avowals of our leading men. It is an unsupported accusation; and because it is so grave, we stamp it as false in fact and a calumny.

The *Review* adds, that this "broad-church principle constitutes the sum and substance of the Plan of Union proposed by the Joint Committee." Here, too, is a great error. Nothing in the plan favors it. A fair interpretation of the first article refutes it. That article says: "The Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures"; and its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies in opposition to Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, and to Arminianism and Pelagianism on the other, shall be regarded as the sense in which it is received and adopted." What theory of assent is here implied? Manifestly, and that only, of accepting "the system" as Calvinistic. There is not a hint about "substance of doctrine;" there is not a sidelong allusion to "essentials of Christianity only." Everybody knows that the "fair historical" sense of

the Confession is plainly and resolutely Calvinistic. And if this were doubtful, the following clause settles it, viz.: "as received by the two bodies in opposition to Antinomianism and Arminianism," etc. What system, what system only, stands thus between and opposed to Antinomianism and Arminianism? Only the Calvinistic. And the phrase, "as received by the two bodies" is directly connected with the words, "in opposition to," etc., without even the intervention of a comma*; so that there is no possible doubt about its meaning that the Confession is received by both parties, in this, and this its only historic, sense. The words, "as it *is* received by the two bodies," are carefully chosen: they indicate what the two bodies *now* profess to be and believe, and wisely avoid reference to past differences. No candid mind can give any other sense to this article, than that it endorses the view, that the Confession is to be received in its integrity as containing the Reformed system of faith. It is a better statement of the true principle than that contained in the Plan of Union of 1758. How, then, does the *Princeton Review* dare to assert that it sanctions the latitudinarian scheme? It thus puts dishonor on its own brethren as well as on us. In its eagerness, it seems to suppose that those whom it is opposing can resort to subtle tricks of language to favor heresy.

As far as we are concerned, too, we see no possible objection, if it will allay any doubts, to adding another clause to this article, expressly declaring, what it undoubtedly implies, that by "the system of doctrine" is meant the system of the Confession itself, in its integrity, as Calvinistic or Reformed.

On this capital point of assent to the Confession, then, we conclude, that there is no real difference between the Old School and the New. We are both willing to accept it as containing the Reformed system of doctrine. We cordially agree, and so we are convinced would our whole New School ministry and eldership, to the statement of this theory as given in the *Princeton Review*. We only demand, that that

* It is so printed in the Minutes and special pamphlets of both Assemblies; but a comma is put in by the *Princeton Review*.

Review retract its false, damaging and unsupported statement of our views. Among honest and candid men, there is really no doubt or question as to what subscription implies. Any candidate, before any of our presbyteries, who should say that he received the Confession "as containing the essential principles of Christianity and no more," would be unhesitatingly rejected by them.

2. The Doctrinal Differences of the Two Schools.

Within the metes and bounds of the "fair historical" sense of the Confession of Faith, certain, somewhat undefined, differences in the mode of explaining its individual doctrines have always been recognized and allowed by the Presbyterian Church in the United States, as well as by all other Reformed churches. These allowable differences must, of course, be such as do not impair the integrity of the system, as distinguished from Lutheranism, Arminianism, Pelagianism, etc., nor vitiate any one of the doctrines that make up the system. But within these limits, there have been, and still are, very considerable diversities. In Switzerland there was a Stapfer as well as a Turretine; in France, there was the school of Saumur as well as that of Montauban; the Heidelberg Catechism and the Decrees of Dort are both Reformed Confessions, yet different in tone; Supralapsarianism, Sublapsarianism, and the Theology of the Covenants, were varying forms of the one Calvinism; the Confession of Westminster itself was a compromise between theological parties; our own Adopting Act recognizes differences upon points "not essential or necessary." The Calvinism of Edwards was of a different type from that even of Dickinson and Davies; Alexander and Woods, Ashbel Green and Richards, did not agree on all points. The Erskines and Glas, Dick and Hill, John Brown and Chalmers, were all Calvinists with variations. Every theological system, and every Confession, is to a certain extent an adjustment of antagonisms. The *Princeton Review*, in its last number, concedes that "the Old School, although averse to the modified Calvinism of New

England, as represented by such men as the late Drs. Richards and Griffin, of Newark, N. J., and many others who agreed with them, and although still more averse to the hyper-Calvinism of the Hopkinsians, never desired that men adopting those views should be excluded from the ministry in our church," (p. 517). If this is generally conceded by the Old School, we have a good starting point for coming to an understanding about even our doctrinal differences. For most of these men agreed in rejecting the explanations and philosophy of the *Princeton Review*, on the three points of imputation, inability and the extent of the atonement. The doctrines they held, but with differing adjustments. They did not regard the imputation of sin as immediate; they qualified the inability as "moral;" and they held to a general provision, though not to a universal application, of the atoning work of Christ. These views, then, are not inconsistent with an honest acceptance of the Confession, nor a bar to ministerial communion; and this by the concession of the *Princeton Review* itself.

That *Review*, also, in the same article, in arguing against the strictest constructionists, says: "No prosecution for doctrinal error has ever been attempted or sanctioned [in the Presbyterian Church of this country] except for errors which were regarded as involving the rejection, *not of explanations of doctrines*, but of the doctrines themselves." For example, in respect to original sin, it allows that either the theory of "representative responsibility," or that of "realism," or even that of "the general law of propagation"—although "not equally scriptural, or equally in harmony with our Confession, nevertheless *leave the doctrine intact*, and do not work a rejection of the system of which it is an essential part." "So also of the doctrine of inability. . . . if the fact be admitted, it is not essential whether the inability be called natural or moral." "Men," too, it goes on to say, "may differ as to the mode of God's providential government or the operations of his grace, and retain the facts which constitute the essence of this

doctrinal scheme." "We do not expect that our ministers should adopt every proposition contained in our standards. This they are not required to do. But they are required to adopt the system ; and that system consists of certain doctrines, no one of which can be omitted without destroying its identity," (pp. 507, 509). All this is excellent against the strict constructionists, and favorable to reunion, and well worthy of being pondered by some brethren on both sides, who are clamorous for having all these doctrines set down, and assented to, in a final form, before we can come together.

Everybody knows that there are such doctrinal differences between the Old School and the New, chiefly in the explanations and philosophy of the doctrines and of the system. But are there not nearly as great differences in each school, as there are between the schools? We think there are. We have some pretty thorough Old School men on almost all the points in the New School ; we know many Old School ministers who can only be classified as New School in point of doctrine. The Old School is divided on the question of immediate and mediate imputation ; the distinction between natural and moral inability and ability, is recognised by many of their divines ; and they very generally preach that the atonement is sufficient for all, while we agree with them that it is applied only to the elect. All that we claim and say is, that these differences are consistent with an intelligent and honest adoption of the standards, and should be no bar to ministerial fellowship. The technical adjustment of them is not a condition of reunion.

It would be utterly impracticable and futile to attempt such an adjustment, and embody it in a Plan of Union. Both parties already have the same Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the best extant. All that we can do is to accept them in their essential and necessary articles, with a recognition of possible, though guarded, diversities of explanation, the system and doctrines remaining in their integrity. Just as soon as we go beyond this, we are involved in inextricable

logomachy. The old disputes, and feuds and warriors come into the van. Each side has its schemes and definitions. Quite a number of able men on both sides would be glad to add codicils to the Confession, and seal the final form of orthodoxy. We must be content to wait for this, till the church is wiser, and better and more united; until, in fact, somebody can give us a perfect form of faith in unison with a perfect system of philosophy, adjusting all antagonisms. A united Presbyterianism may possibly, on the eve of the millennium, breed such a theologian, but the time is not yet. We do not know the man, nor even the school that is now qualified to do this immortal work. The wisest and best and most learned men we have, are just the ones who would shrink from attempting it. Our tyros and partisans are all ready for it, and would not make much of it. The points of difference we ought to be willing, on all proper occasions, to state and discuss; they are important in their place, and some of them are essential to the order and coherence of the system; but they can not be embodied in a new confession.* Any further questions that may arise, as to the orthodoxy of this or that man, are utterly irrelevant to reünion. No one man's system is good enough for the reünited church.

How is it, now, that the *Princeton Review*, after making so many concessions, is still able, on this point, to frame such an indictment against the New School, as to reject reünion? It does this, not by attempting to prove "the prevalence of heresy in the New School Church," or denying "its general orthodoxy," but by the unqualified assertion, that the New School admits to its ministry men who "openly deny" the essential doctrines of the Confession, such as original sin, in-

* When the Southern Presbyterian churches reünited, in 1864, a kind of Confession was agreed upon informally, but not embodied in the act of reünion. That Confession may serve as a warning; it is theologically a confusing and inconsistent document. In particular, on immediate imputation, it "surrenders at discretion." In the reünion of 1758, no new confession seems to have been thought of.

ability, the atonement as a real satisfaction to the law and justice of God. It says, that "it is as clear as day," that this is the case; that our church "freely receives and ordains" men who do this; that the programme of the Joint Committee would allow it; and that therefore "union with the New School Church, on the proposed programme, would be the renunciation of a principle to which the Old School are pledged, in honor, in conscience, and by solemn vows." It charges the Old School members of the Committee with being virtually misled on this point by the New School; and seems somehow to have found out that, in that Committee, the New School members, when speaking of the orthodoxy of our church, were speaking only of themselves "individually," and said what is quite untrue of the New School Church as a whole. It says, "the New School members of the Committee assured them [the Old School members,] that as for themselves they did adopt the Confession as we do. This is no doubt true of them individually, but it is as clear as day that it is not true of the New School as a Church."

These are quite serious charges now all round. We venture the assertion, that the New School members of that Committee did not speak of themselves "individually" on this matter, but testified, from what they know of our church as a whole, that it did honestly accept the Confession of Faith. And does the *Princeton Review* know more about the real opinions of the New School than we do ourselves? The Searcher of hearts could not be more positive than is the *Review* on this point, where it must get its information chiefly from us, and where we directly contradict it. It says that "everybody" knows, what we say nobody can know—for it is not so. Men are not admitted to our ministry who deny these cardinal doctrines of the Reformed system. The charge is reckless and baseless. If the *Princeton Review* does not know better, it ought to know better. It is essentially unfair to judge a great religious body by hearsay and rumor, by the exaggerations and eccentricities of individuals, by past

feuds and not by present acts, by prejudicial conjectures and not by public documents and authentic records. But the *Review* gives no documentary evidence. It speaks *ex cathedra* as if its mere dictum established truth and fact.

To substantiate its accusation, it refers to a certain scheme of what it calls the "New Divinity," which it says, "is publicly avowed and taught by not a few of their [our] ministers." This scheme, as here presented, is what is popularly known as the New Haven theology, an eccentric and provincial phase of New England theology. But even the most consistent New Haven men would refuse assent to some of the points and many of the inferences here made. It is reduced to three propositions: 1. That "ability limits obligation," with the inferences, that there is no moral character before moral action, no hereditary depravity and no original sin. 2. "That a free agent can always act in opposition to any amount of influence that can be brought to bear upon him;" and that, consequently, certainty is inconsistent with free agency; God cannot control man's acts; there is no election; regeneration is the act of the sinner and not of God; and God cannot prevent sin in a moral system. 3. "A regard to our own happiness is the ground of obligation. We are bound to do whatever gives us most *enjoyment*. Our whole allegiance is to ourselves. If serving the world, sin, or Satan, would make us happier than serving God, we should be bound to serve sin."

This is the system, or its caricature; and the New School, it is alleged, has "refused to allow these doctrines to be condemned," ordains men who hold them, and they are "publicly taught" in our churches. We say, on the contrary, that the New School has virtually condemned this system as here presented; that it does not ordain men who hold it; and that some of the principles and all of the main inferences, as thus given, would be as universally repudiated among us as in the Old School. In respect to the "happiness" principle, for example, Dr. Taylor himself did not espouse it in the

sense or form here laid down ; but even in his more subtle mode of statement, it would be generally reprobated by the whole of the New School. And on the other points, the Auburn Convention formally adopted an "Explication of Doctrine," drawn up by the New School members of the Assembly of 1837, in which these topics were candidly explained, and the inferences above made formally repudiated. This is authentic and documentary evidence. Thus, they say expressly, that "God permitted the introduction of sin, not because He could not prevent it consistently with the moral freedom of his creatures, but for wise and benevolent reasons which He has not revealed." They speak of regeneration, as "a radical change of heart, produced by the special operations of the Holy Ghost, determining the sinner to that which is good." "Original sin is a natural bias to evil, resulting from the first apostasy, leading invariably and certainly to actual transgression. And all infants, as well as adults, in order to be saved, need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost." "The sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental, and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, *i. e.*, a substitute for the punishment due to transgressors." And so on other points.*

That there are differences of opinion on certain abstract principles about the will, ability and inability, and the nature and mode of the divine influence, we do not deny. There are differences among ourselves ; there are differences in the Old School also ; there have always been, and may always be, differences in the church. For here is the mysterious region where the infinite and the finite, divine and human agency, come together ; and what mortal vision has penetrated that mystery ? Here is where moral obligation, moral agency, and personal responsibility are at stake. Divine sovereignty and human freedom here come to their closest contact, and the problem of theology is to save both. There is a fair and

* Dr. Monfort in *The Presbyterian* (Sept. 25) argues well and ably, that the paper on Doctrinal Errors, adopted by the Assembly of 1837, is the common property of both branches ; the New School never repealed it.

broad distinction between natural and moral ability and inability. The differences here, as they actually exist, are of more or less, rather than of Yes and No. We do not all agree in our philosophy and metaphysics; and do we need to do so, in order to ministerial fellowship? If any one so holds the fact of man's freedom and ability as to deny the doctrines of God's omnipotence, and of original sin, he of course could not accept our Confession of Faith, and would be rejected by our presbyteries. Does the *Princeton Review* know of any such, who have been accepted? We do not. A man may hold an abstract thesis, and deny our inferences from it; and we can not hold him responsible for our inferences. He may be inconsistent; but consistency, though a jewel, is not essential to ministerial communion; else we should find it difficult to fraternize even with the *Princeton Review* in all its moods. There must be toleration on points not essential and necessary, or there can not be either union or reünion.

We say, then, if any one demands that we should tie ourselves down to any single extreme explanations of the mooted points of imputation, inability, and a limited atonement, we could not accept even reünion at such a price. Even the *Princeton Review* does not seem to stand upon this. Some may hold and continue to teach immediate imputation, an unqualified inability, and an exclusive limitation in the very design of the atonement. But no one has the right to say that such views are essential to the integrity of the Reformed system, or to an honest adhesion to all its doctrines. Any school that does this, assumes what it has no right to assume; it creates a narrow and partial standard of orthodoxy, to which we owe no allegiance. Even if we held the same doctrines, we would deny the dictation. No man and no school can say, that historical Calvinism is necessarily identified with such partial views; other men, the best, wisest and most learned in both schools, know that this is not the case. The spirit that fosters reünion is opposed to such exclusive claims. For these extreme views represent one phase, and one only, of the Calvinistic system; there are other and

broadier phases. It was, we believe, from the very first, a historical and theological mistake to put the defense of our Confession, against the one-sided theories of the "New Divinity," on these equally one-sided theories of the older Calvinism—as though these antagonisms represented the only phases of theological belief. This is not so. The bulk of our ministry and churches have never gone with either extreme; they have kept the true *via media*. In this middle and temperate zone lies the solid faith of our churches, making them strong for solid work.

On the points of doctrinal belief, then, it is our conviction, that the two schools are substantially agreed, and can unite in a common confession. There are no differences that may not honestly be brought under the constitutional form of assent, as explained by the *Princeton Review*. There are no differences which do not fairly come under historical Calvinism. We can both receive the Reformed system of faith, and its individual doctrines, in their integrity, while differing in explanations and proportions. If we did not believe this, we would not, and could not, favor reunion. Apart from theological technicalities and philosophical explanations, we are one in accepting that grand old system of faith, Pauline, Augustinian and Reformed, which has been the vital substance and stay of the church in its main conflicts with error and unbelief. We believe in the one only Triune God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Godman, divine and human, consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity, and consubstantial with us men according to his humanity; and in the Holy Ghost, the lord and giver of life, who alone renews and sanctifies our fallen human nature. We believe that God created all things from nothing, by the word of his power; that in his all-wise providence He sustains and governs all his creatures and all their actions; that by his decree all things stand, that in his wise, holy and eternal purpose all our destiny, for time and for eternity, is embraced—yet so that violence is not done to the will of creature, nor is the liberty and contingency of second causes

taken away, but rather established. We also confess the essential doctrines, which make the distinguishing and vital substance of the Reformed system,—original sin, as derived from Adam, since we sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression; total depravity, which makes us averse to all good, and unable, of ourselves, to repent and believe—yet so that this inability is moral, rooted also in our personal responsibility, and stricken with our own and not merely a foreign guilt; the atoning work of our Lord, not symbolical and governmental only, but also a proper sacrifice for sin, and thus a satisfaction to the divine justice as well as a revelation of the divine love; the covenant of redemption, wherein this atonement was made so general as to be sufficient for all and to be offered unto all, and so particular as to be effectually applied in the salvation of believers; personal election unto everlasting life, and the final perseverance of those who are effectually called. Justification only by the righteousness of Christ, regeneration only by the power of the Holy Ghost, sanctification, progressive here and completed hereafter, and endless life in Christ, we equally confess and believe. With all the diversities of the imperfect and jarring speech of earth, there is amongst us a substantial accord in that which makes the unison and melody of the one language of heaven.

If such, now, be the state of the case as to our interpretation of the terms of subscription, and as to our real doctrinal belief,—what judgment must we and others form as to the representations made of us in the *Princeton Review*? We can not be silent under such imputations, for too much is at stake; nor will we retort them. We are bound, on both sides, as matters now stand, to say nothing that we should wish to retract, provided the reunion is consummated. But the *Princeton Review* has said what, in common courtesy, it must take back, if we come together. It has made specific charges, which we definitely deny. They are charges which affect our Christian faith and honor. They are made in a

dictatorial tone. They have aroused a general feeling of indignation throughout our church, and among many in the Old School, who are surprised and grieved at these unproved denunciations in the midst of our reunion conferences. Such accusations put grave difficulties in the way of reunion, and they will be frowned upon by all in case we come together. Then, if not now, they must be given right up. Then, if not now, it will be a violation of Christian courtesy and honor, and a desecration of a fraternal compact, to assert or insinuate unproven charges of heresy, and false doctrine, and evasive subscription, against our ministry and our churches. We would not enter into reunion where any school or review was allowed to assume such a tone. Now it is done to prevent reunion; it is a desperate charge on which all is staked. If defeated, as we believe it will be, such things may be forgotten, if they are not reiterated. But these discordant and belligerent tones are sadly out of place in negotiations for reunion. Already many, very many, who have seen these violent accusations, and have read the emphatic and unanimous denial of all our journals and many of our leading men, are beginning to see that a cause which requires such means is one that ought not, for the good of the church, to carry the day. The whole argument against us has been pitched on the highest possible key; the Old School, it seems to have been thought, must be made to feel that their all was at stake, that heresy and latitudinarianism were about to overwhelm them; that the New School, irrevocably committed to the fostering of heterodoxy, had virtually hoodwinked and overslaughed the Old School members of the Joint Committee and their last Assembly—so that unless the Old School rose *en masse* and rejected the whole scheme, it would renounce the principles to which it is “pledged in honor, in conscience, and by solemn vows.” Now all this, when fairly and fully stated, is worse than uncharitableness, it is a blunder. Nobody can really believe it. The whole thing is overdone, and likely to go by the board. Nobody can believe that the Joint Committee

was so blind, and weak and silly. And nobody does believe, that there is in the Presbyterian Church any infallible teacher or supreme commander. It is quite too much for any review to claim a monopoly, not only of Presbyterian orthodoxy, but also of the Presbyterian conscience.

The character of the argument in the *Princeton Review* becomes still more apparent, when it presses the matter to the conclusion, that if this Plan of the Committee be adopted, the reunited church will have "forfeited the moral right to all endowments, whether of churches, or boards or seminaries;" and this on the ground, that this Plan "abandons the principles" on which the Presbyterian Church was founded. The writer is not speaking of the strictly "legal" questions, which are in the hands of an able Committee, but of the "moral" right; and it is this right which is said to be lost by this Plan! That is, this plan unpresbyterianizes the Presbyterian Church, so that it loses its proper identity, and becomes something else and opposite. This, now, we say, is a gross, an incredible, a fictitious plea. What does the Plan, then, mean and say? Why, simply that we reunite on the basis of an honest adherence to our common standards! And such a reunion, says the *Review*, works the "moral" forfeiture of all our endowments. Logic could not be more lame, nor exaggeration more unqualified.

In respect, then, to the charges of the *Princeton Review* against the Committee's Plan, and against the New School, on the capital points of assent to the Confession, and doctrinal soundness, we claim that they are refuted, partly by its manifest exaggerations, for such exaggeration is always a sign of conscious weakness, what is wanting in facts being made up by a painful stress of emphasis; partly by its concessions, for it really grants all for which we really contend, both as to doctrine and subscription; partly by its failure to give any proof of its wanton and cruel accusations; and also by the manifest animus of the article, which is to prevent reunion at all hazards, by arousing dormant suspicions, inflaming the *odium*

theologicum, firing the Presbyterian conscience, and rekindling a warfare of which the church is weary, and which will only lead to ceaseless discussion, dissension and division. If its end be gained, it will be gained by the ruin of the fairest prospects and best hopes of the Presbyterian Church in these United States.

We had intended to comment on other articles in the Plan of the Committee, but have not now the space. These two are fundamental; if we can come to an agreement here, all the other points may be adjusted, if need be by further mutual concessions. And we can come to an agreement here, on the basis of the concessions made by the *Princeton Review*. Let it abandon its groundless imputations and the way is clear. Or, does that *Review* really mean, not liking to say,—“letting ‘I dare not’ wait upon ‘I would’”—that reünion is impossible until the three peculiarities of the Princeton type of theology are accepted by our New School churches. Does it mean, that we must repeat its shibboleths of immediate imputation, unqualified inability, and a partial atonement? If this is what it means, both the Old School and the New School ought to understand it; and then we shall see, whether even the Old School is prepared to make this an imperative condition. If it is, reünion is undesirable and impossible. We will concede all we can, but concessions have their limits.

The chief responsibility for reünion now rests with the Old School. God in his Providence has laid this task upon it, and momentous results are pending on its decision. Perhaps it is the most important question it will have to decide for the next generation; for, if the present attempt fails, we see not when and how it can be again renewed. Now is the golden opportunity. Once we were together. We have a long and common tradition of sacred compacts, sealed with the best blood of patriots and Christians. For many years we battled side by side with unbroken front against the powers of sin and unbelief, and our victorious hosts spread over all the

land. Then came a sad and fierce internal strife. Our branch of the Church was cut off by an arbitrary act, which, we have always thought, violated both the spirit and the forms of our constitution. Our name was cast out as evil. We went on our way, trusting in God's Providence to vindicate the right. We became consolidated both as to doctrine and polity; and we also cast in our lot with the poor and down-trodden slave, and so lost all our Southern churches; yet we grew stronger and stronger. The Old School cast in its lot rather with the Southern churches, and for a quarter of a century its highest courts were dumb to the cry of those in bonds. A righteous and terrible retribution has come upon the whole land for the sin of slavery and complicity therewith. Almost all the Southern Presbyterian churches are now wholly separated from the Northern; and this seemed to open the way for reunion at the North. The Old School, as it made the division, made, as was meet, the first advance towards reunion. We accepted its proposal for a Joint Committee. That Committee prepared its admirable Report—the work of neither School, the product of no one mind, the joint and nearly unanimous project of the whole Committee. Our Assembly virtually endorsed it; the Old School sent it down, unaltered, to its churches. It may be modified and made more precise in some of its details, but essentially as it stands it must probably be finally accepted or rejected. And now, in the midst of our fraternal negotiations, the chief quarterly *Review* of the Old School sounds the alarm, charges our New School Committee with not knowing or misrepresenting the real views of our church, charges our church with sanctioning a dishonest principle of subscription and with fostering heresy, and charges even the Joint Committee with abandoning the vital principles of the Presbyterian Church and with endorsing what it has always contended against. Was it to such an entertainment that we were invited, when the Old School asked us to appoint our Committee? To such an entertainment we can not, and we will not, twice come. The Old School must, by

its action, disown these imputations, or break off the negotiations. The responsibility is now in its hands. We are ready to accept reunion on fair and honorable terms, and on no other.

And the question must be soon decided. Both parties are and will be hampered by a long delay. We both have a great work to do, together or apart. If you say together, we will join you heart and hand. And if you say, apart—so be it. We are vigorous, elastic and united. We are not yet doing half of what we ought to do. We are ready for the race. And we will contend with you in an earnest and peaceful rivalry all through our boundless prairies, and along our majestic rivers, and up and down the slopes of our grand Western mountains, rich in gold and silver; wherever our teeming population wanders and clusters, there, too, we will go, if not with you, yet laboring by your side, for our sacred and common cause, the cause of our only Lord and Master. And when this our task is done, and this our land has become the land of Christ, then, on the shores of the peaceful Pacific, if not now on the stormy Atlantic coast, we will clasp inseparable hands, and repeat with penitence and faith that hallowed petition of our interceding Lord—"That they all may be one!"

But better, far better, wiser, far wiser, that we go together. A separate existence, based in mutual misunderstandings and misrepresentations, cannot be best for either side. Why may we not forget or tolerate our non-essential differences, and rise to the full stature of our work? The strength of Presbyterianism is in its doctrine and polity; its weakness is, in its tenacity for non essentials—here is the main cause of its divisions. This is not in harmony with the spirit of the nineteenth century, with the true spirit of American Presbyterianism, or with the spirit of Christianity. We need a broader basis for our work. Ours must be an American, and not an imported, still less a merely Scotch, Presbyterianism. Much as we love and honor Scotland, we can not there find the

perfect type for our free and growing church. The Scotch bag-pipe doubtless discourses most excellent music, and we like to hear it; but we do not care to be restricted to it, especially when it is out of sorts; and we seem to have heard some loftier and more inspiring strains. The Psalms of David are good to be sung in the old Scotch version; but even in public worship it is also well to sing such hymns as "Blest be the tie that binds." It is goodly to sit down at the Lord's table with those who literally accept every proposition of our somewhat long Confession; it is better to sit down at the Lord's table with all who can humbly partake of the life-giving symbols of the passion of our Lord. We can have cordial fellowship with those who hold to the strictest forms of Calvinism, provided we are not compelled to repeat only their words and to withhold a freer gospel. If we can learn to bear with one another's weaknesses, we may be united and become strong. Otherwise, we must keep on, divided, and subdividing; and our wilfulness becomes our folly.

The question we are now helping to decide is really this,—whether we can have an American Presbyterian Church, or whether we are to be given over to perpetual conflicts, and provincial assemblies. And to all who really love our Reformed faith and Presbyterian order, this is a vital point, that needs to be laid well to heart. There is an unbroken Roman Catholic, and a reunited Episcopal Church, each stretching all over the land. Congregationalists are working together, in spite of their intense individualism. The Methodists and Baptists, North and South, will doubtless ere long come to terms. If we believe that our faith and polity are better than any of these, we must use the means to insure success. Every other denomination in the land wonders why we do not unite. Impartial observers tell us that our continued separation and strife bring reproach upon our common Christianity. Our reunion is recommended and enforced, not only by all the general arguments for Christian union, by the necessity of making an organized stand against inroads of in-

fidelity and superstition, and by the plain admonitions of God's Holy Word ; but also by the special and cogent reason, that we have the same standards of doctrine and of polity. A united Presbyterian Church, combining our main divisions, would be a powerful organization. Reunion would stimulate us to renewed efforts. We could at once lay a noble thank-offering on the altar of the Lord. All our schemes would be enlarged and vitalized. Our Boards of Foreign and Home Missions could soon double their work. Our best young men would have strong inducements to flock into our ministry. We might look, with more confidence, to the favor and blessing of our Lord. Why may not this be? What are any partial and partisan ends compared with this magnificent prospect? Let us come together. The one stream, flowing for a while parted, with some debatable land between, will be reunited in a broader, deeper and swifter channel, the debatable ground left behind, and before us that delectable land, towards which we were trending even while sundered, our common port and haven, where our earthly conflicts will be forgotten in our eternal fellowship. Then shall our peace be as a river, and our righteousness as the waves of the sea, and the Prince of peace will crown us with his benignant blessing.

NOTE.—Since writing the above, we have received the article from the *Princeton Review* on which we have commented, reprinted in a pamphlet form, with the name of the Rev. Charles Hodge, D. D., as its author. We deeply and unfeignedly regret to see that venerable name associated with such an article, and to be obliged to hold Dr. Hodge personally accountable for its grave misrepresentations. He can hardly be aware of the depth and strength of the indignant feelings, which his article has called forth in all parts of our church.

Dr. Hodge has a perfect right to oppose reunion ; but he has no right to oppose it so as to attach to us the opprobrium of sanctioning an "immoral" principle, or of conniving at heresy.

In a Preface, he notices some of the objections made to his article. He says that he has not made "a sweeping charge of heresy against the New School." He is indeed kind enough to praise the orthodoxy of "many" among us ; but still he does charge us as "a church" with fostering heresy. He further says, that in ascribing to our church a lax rule of subscription, he does not accuse any of us of "a grave moral offense," nor "soil with a breath the char-

acter of any individual in the New School Church, nor that Church itself." Why not? Because, he says, such a lax principle may come to be a matter of common agreement, as in the Episcopal and other churches. This, too, may be kindly meant, but we can not accept it—*haud tali auxilio*. We have no such agreement about it, for the simple reason that we repudiate the lax principle just as much as does Dr. Hodge. We hold with him, that it is "wrong," that it "will work great evil," and that "it is utterly inconsistent with the principles and the obligations," he says, "of the Old School body," we say, of the Presbyterian Church. He charges us with holding a principle which he considers "immoral," and charitably suggests that we may hold it unstained, because we do not see that it is immoral, or have agreed that it is not. This seems to be saving our character at the expense of our moral perceptions. The Cretans might all have agreed not to consider lying a sin, but they would have been liars for all that. Dr. Hodge makes out almost as bad a case for us as our apologist as he did against us as our accuser. His intentions may be excellent, but he is plainly lacking in judgment or sympathy. These principles are altogether too accommodating to suit us. *Haud istis defensoribus*.

What is further said in this Preface about the amount of the evidence he adduces in support of his accusations against us, and about our favoring the "New Divinity," is sufficiently answered in the preceding pages.

There is one curious omission in this notice of objections to his article; he refers to almost all, excepting the main one, on which the whole hinges; and one he must have seen in every New School notice of his article. That objection thus becomes conspicuous by its absence. It is this, that we utterly and unanimately disavow the principle of subscription which he imputes to us. The present posture of this matter is most extraordinary, and well nigh unexampled, especially in negotiations for a peaceful and fraternal reunion. One of the parties is charged with holding a certain lax principle; it instantly and earnestly repudiates it; and the accuser, knowing this disclaimer, reprints the accusation, and fakes no notice of the denial. But the point is so vital, and the issues at stake are so momentous, that we can not allow it to be evaded. No accuser has the right thus to trifle with the fair rules of controversy. We put the matter in a simple and direct form:

Dr. Hodge says, that the New School Church adopts and acts on the following principle as to the terms of subscription, viz.: That the Confession is to be received "as containing the essential doctrines of Christianity and nothing more." This we directly and unanimately deny. It is now Dr. Hodge's turn to speak.

Further: We say that we adopt the principle of subscription which he advocates; that this principle is really implied in the Plan of Union of the Joint Committee; and that we are willing to have it distinctly stated in this Plan. This is the heart of the matter. If this principle is formally incorporated into the Plan of Union, is Dr. Hodge, so far as this point is concerned, in favor of a reunion of the Old and New Schools?

ART. VII.—NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

THEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Lectures on Christian Theology. By ENOCH POND, D.D., Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. Congregational Board, Boston. A new edition, stereotyped. Many favorable notices of this work have appeared, and now that one edition of the work is exhausted so soon as to make it desirable to stereotype a second, it would seem the "Lectures" commend themselves and need no further commendation from us. It must be gratifying to the venerable author, to know that this crowning work of his life is received with so much favor, and to see such proof of realizing his "most earnest desire, that they (the Lectures) may be instrumental in diffusing a correct and connected knowledge of gospel truth."

In his Preface, Dr. Pond says: "They are *Theological Essays*, written out in full and read to the students, not to be servilely copied or imitated, but to awaken thought and interest." "Prepared in this way and for such a purpose, the Lectures are adapted to be read and studied by intelligent Christians generally. They are adapted to be used in theological classes, should any such be found in our congregations. They are adapted and intended for a somewhat wide circulation."

Many laymen as well as ministers, out of, as well as in, N. E., we doubt not will read these lucid pages, and be edified by them, when their author's long and useful life on earth shall close.

T. R. H.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Edited by A. ROBERTS, D.D., and JAS. DONALDSON, LL.D. Vol. III. TATIAN, THEOPHILUS and the CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS, translated by Pratten, Dods and Dr. Thos. Smith. Vol. IV. *The Writings of CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA*, (first vol.) translated by Rev. W. Wilson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Scribner, 1867. These volumes complete the first year's subscription to this new and important series of works. The project of translating all the writings of the Fathers, up to A. D. 325, has met with a cordial welcome and encouragement among Christian scholars in Great Britain and this country. It is an admirable plan, much beyond anything of the kind as yet attempted in the English language. All our public libraries, and all private ministerial libraries of any pretensions, must have this series of books. And thus far the execution, both in respect to the translations themselves, and also in the style of publication, is highly creditable.

The third volume of the series gives us first of all, Tatian's well-known "Address to the Greeks," ascetic in its spirit, but chiefly devoted to exposing the enormities of the Greek religion. The Three Books of Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus refute the prevailing objections to Christianity. The apocryphal Recognitions of Clement are one of the earliest specimens of theological romance.

The fourth volume contains writings of Clement of Alexandria, the head of the great Catechetical School of Alexandria, viz.: his Exhortation to the

Heathen; his Instructor (Pædagogus); and the first book of his *Stromata* or *Miscellanies*. Here are the beginnings of a Christian philosophy.

The reading of these volumes will do more, than any history can, to lead the student to understand the general character of Christian opinion in the latter part of the second century.

The Theology of the Greek Poets. By W. S. TYLER, Professor of Greek in Amherst College. Boston: Draper & Halliday, 1867. The six topics discussed by Dr. Tyler in this instructive volume are: 1. The Head of the Church Head over all Things; 2. The Homeric Question; 3. The Homeric Doctrine of God; 4. The Homeric Doctrine of Sin; 5. The Theology of Æchylus; 6. The Theology of Sophocles. The third and fourth of these were originally published in our Review; the first appeared in the Biblical Repository, and the rest in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Andover. The topics were so ably handled as to attract wide attention, and lead the author to put them into a volume. He intended to add an exposition of the theology of Euripides, which, though not so important as the rest, would complete the series. We trust that this may yet be done in a future edition.

Scholars and divines will welcome this scholarly, and philosophical contribution to the philosophy of religion. We see how heathenism longed for and needed Christianity. Professor Tyler does not exaggerate this, as is sometimes done, but he shows us the truth of the case. Christianity was not developed out of heathenism, but it solved its problems and so met its wants. The substance of many long treatises is here given in a condensed and attractive form. We wish that the author might do the same service in respect to the Greek philosophers.

The Human Element in the Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. By T. F. CURTIS, D. D., late Professor of Theology in the University of Lewisburg, Pa. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1867, pp. 386. The theory advocated in this volume is (p. 120), that "inspiration gave to them" [the Apostles, etc.,] "certain divine powers as a whole, leaving the individual and human errors to be eliminated by degrees," etc. And these errors are found in their writings. On p. 325, we are told "the church is a living and inspired body." On p. 326, in answer to the question, "Where shall we find an infallible and complete Revelation?" the author "replies frankly, 'No where on Earth.'" These principles carried out will lead the writer much further than he is at present inclined to go. His book contains interesting accounts of various theories of inspiration, and a tolerable summary of the objections to the strictest views of inspiration; but it will give little light or aid in forming a correct theory.

Observations on the Authenticity of the Gospels. By A. LAYMAN. Chicago: H. P. Chandler, 1867, pp. 109. This beautifully printed volume, published at Chicago, is written by an eminent Boston jurist, who is also a Swedenborgian. It objects to the positions taken by Professor Greenleaf in his "Examination of the Four Evangelists," as too technical and as irrelevant. At the same time, from a careful examination and summary of the facts, it comes to the conclusion, that the historical evidence for the authenticity of the four Gospels is unanswerable, on the basis of the generally recognised rules of historical testimony. This summary is exceedingly

well made; few lawyers have such familiarity with all the facts in the case; and few divines could marshal the evidence so completely and carefully. But Swedenborgianism demands more than this; for full conviction it requires a so-called "internal sense." And the last part of the treatise is devoted to an exposition and defense of this recondite theory, in its application in part to the Four Gospels. We do not see that this helps the argument, excepting in the case of those who receive the internal sense. And we would rather try to convince a sceptic of the trustworthiness of the Gospels than of the reality and necessity of this internal sense.

PRACTICAL RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

The American Tract Society, New York, has published *Paul Verner; or, the Forge and Pulpit. Based on Facts*, (pp. 371,) narrating the successful struggles of a youth, in the midst of temptation, to secure an education, which resulted in the presidency of a college,—very well told; *The Times of Knox and Mary Stuart*, by Mrs S. T. MARTYN (pp. 359,) also interesting; another volume from the fertile and pungent pen of Dr. TODD, entitled *Hints and Thoughts for Christians*, (pp. 260); *Toils and Triumphs of Union Missionary Colportage*, by one of the Secretaries, an authentic record of a noble work; *The Cinnamon Isle Boy*, by Mrs. E. C. HUTCHINGS; *A Mother's Legacy*, by Mrs. SPROAT; *The Bible Reader's Help*, a useful manual; *Bible Prayers*, arranged by Dr. Jonas King, an excellent manual; *The Syrian Leper*, by Dr. E. P. ROGERS, an earnest and forcible exhibition of the malady and cure of sin. The same Society has published Tischendorf's admirable work on the Gospels, in both English and German; it ought to be widely circulated.

The American Tract Society, Boston, has issued a series of beautiful volumes, well adapted to Sunday School libraries and general circulation: *Lessons on the Life of Jonah*, by Professor GAUSSEN; *Glimpses of West Africa*, by Rev. S. J. WHITON—a faithful and interesting account of the tribes near the Mendi mission; *The Honorable Club and Other Tales*, by LYNDE PALMER, a bright and pleasing work; *A Sister's Story*, a narrative of unusual interest; *Following the Leader; Testimonies to the Truths of Christianity*, collected by Senator WILSON; and Rev. I. P. WARREN's forcible tract against the Annihilationists.

The Presbyterian Publication Committee, Philadelphia, have added to their list of books, Miss WHATELY's excellent *Story of Martin Luther*, (pp. 354); and *The Berry Pickers of Wisconsin*, (pp. 245,) an interesting tale; both volumes are brought out in a creditable style.

David, der König von Israel. Von Dr. FRIEDR. WILHELM KRUMMACHER, Berlin; Wiegandt und Grieben, 1867, pp. 428. Dr. Krummacher has produced another work, which will take its place by the side of his widely circulated books on Elisha and Elijah. It is a graphic picture of the life and times of King David, with constant reference to his Psalms, and breathing the deepest spirit of Old Testament piety, as containing a longing for, and prophecy of, the great Son of David. The principles of all history, and of all religious experience, are found imbedded in the

divine oracles. The work is full of faith, enforced at times by an impassioned eloquence. It will lead to a better understanding of the real genius of the Old Testament.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

History of England. Reign of Elizabeth. Vols. III, IV (IX and X, of the complete work). By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, A. M. New York: Scribner & Co., 1867. These two volumes cover six years of the reign of Elizabeth, from 1567 to 1573, including some of the most important events of this great transition period in English history—the consolidation of the Protestant Power, the intrigues of Mary of Scotland, and the conflicts in Ireland. The character of Mary is described, and her numerous plots are ferreted out, with an almost judicial impartiality and accuracy. The course of the narrative shows, that either Elizabeth or Mary must fall. The halo with which a poetical sympathy has so long invested the fair and false Scotch Queen, is somewhat rudely dissipated. Elizabeth's character is presented in some new lights: more account is made of her irresolution and chicanery than is usual. But the impression given is, that the author allows history to speak for itself, instead of going to it with a preconceived theory about its actors and events.

His vindication of the Scotch Reformation, and his account of Knox, are especially noteworthy. Not that Mr. Froude has any special sympathy with the theology of the old reformer—far from it; but he sees clearly the political bearing of the Reformation, and that England would have been lost to the reform, and fallen back into the arms of Rome, had it not been for Scotch Presbyterianism, headed by John Knox. "No grander figure," he says, "can be found in the entire history of the Reformation in this island, than that of Knox. The time has come when English history may do justice to one, but for whom the Reformation would have been overthrown among ourselves; for the spirit which Knox created saved Scotland; and if Scotland had been Catholic again, neither the wisdom of Elizabeth's Ministers, nor the teaching of her Bishops, nor her own chicaneries could have preserved England from revolution." This is a large and just historical induction.

Joseph Reed: a Historical Essay. By GEORGE BANCROFT. New York: W. J. Widdleton, 1867, pp. 64. Mr. Bancroft has, in this pamphlet, performed an apparently ungracious, but in fact a necessary service, in such a trenchant and conclusive manner, that there will be little occasion for reviving the controversy as to the patriotism and fidelity of President Reed. The controversy was forced upon him; and he has not shrunk from doing full justice to the subject. The array of evidence is complete and decisive. It is a capital specimen, in itself, of the art of historical criticism. Mr. Bancroft's translation of the disputed German phrase, (p. 28,) is manifestly the only tenable one. That Mr. Reed was "irresolute," "vacillating," and "pusillanimous," and that "in moments of crisis he was of no significance," is fully made out.

History of the American Civil War. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York: 1867. This first volume of Dr. Draper's comprehensive plan expounds the causes of the war, and its preludes up to the close of Buchanan's administration. Its peculiarity consists in the

stress it lays upon climate and other physical causes in producing the differences between the Northern and Southern States, and thus "inevitably" leading to collision and civil war. "Societies," say the author, "advance in a preordained and inevitable course,"—which is doubtless true as a theological position, though unguardedly stated; but Dr. Draper does not mean it in the theological sense, but in the physical and physiological. One explanation of the problem of our national conflict is found (chap. vi.) in the character of a population, developed along "the climatic zone, bounded on the north by the July isothermal line of 77° , and on the south by that of 84° ." Carthage and our southernmost States both lie within this zone, and hence their striking similarity! though Carthage had comparatively little slave-trade; but Morocco, in the same region, had more. The January isothermal line of 41° passes through the Border States, and in Europe just divides the Roman Catholic from the Protestant population, even in Ireland, (though it also divides France and China)—and is the axis upon which all great men have appeared. In the Southern hemisphere, however, it is "an impressive fact" that the January isothermal is altogether a sea-line; and this is doubtless the reason why it has not there also stimulated the production of great men, for "a great land expansion has been one of the determining conditions of civilization."

Nobody denies that physical causes have much to do with the development of both individual and national character. But it is a great error to make these the chief determining element in history; and to represent them as controlling all historic development by an "inevitable necessity;" and to call this the "philosophy of history." Entirely different nationalities are found in the same zones and under the same physical influences. Man's work is to use, to subdue nature. Yielding to nature makes him a mere animal. Man is man, just because he is not necessarily subject to these physical laws. All culture, all individual and national development, are found in using nature for higher, for æsthetic, for moral, for religious ends.

Incidentally, Dr. Draper recognizes this at different points of his elaborate work; but he does not allow it, as he ought, to govern his general theory. Many broad generalizations of events are scattered through these pages; some of the groupings are effectively presented. He is a forcible and eloquent writer. His statement of the case, as between the north and the south, is, in most particulars, just. His sympathies are with human rights and progress. The preliminary causes and the events leading to the war have on the whole nowhere been more comprehensively presented, although the moral and religious elements are kept too much in the back-ground.

The Miscellaneous Writings of MILES P. SQUIER, D. D. With an Autobiography. Edited by Rev. James R. Boyd. Geneva, N. Y., 1867, pp. 408. With a faithful likeness of the author. The writings of Dr. Squier here published consist of several interesting lectures on a tour in Europe, and lectures, discourses and reviews on theological and philosophical subjects. His autobiography contains many interesting reminiscences. His useful life was devoted to the service of the church in various spheres of labor. The bent of his mind drew him to the investigation of many knotty questions in philosophy and theology. In philosophy, he was an earnest opponent of all views which seemed to him to undermine the fundamental principles of man's rational and ethical nature,—though some of his speculations, for example, on the origin of evil, did not secure any general acceptance.

The Early Years of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. Completed under the direction of Her Majesty the Queen, by Lieut.-General the Hon. C. Grey. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1867. With two likenesses of Prince Albert, one at the age of four, the other at the age of twenty. The record of no life could be more simply and truthfully told than is that of Prince Albert, in

this volume, up to the time of his marriage with Queen Victoria. It is a beautiful and instructive picture. The account of the preliminaries of the marriage, the courtship if we may so call it, is given with great fidelity. How few kings and queens in history have had such a training, or such a married life. It is a volume of deep interest.

PHILOSOPHY.

Einleitung in die Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie christlicher Zeit. (Introduction to the History of Philosophy and Theology in Christian Times.) pp. 465. *Zur Propädeutik für Geschichte der Philosophie des Alterthums*, pp. 126. *Zur Geschichte der Philosophie neuester Zeit von Ende des 18 Jahrhunderts*, pp. 136. (Introductions to the History of the Ancient, and of the most Recent Philosophy.) Wiegandt and Grieben, publishers, Berlin. Without title pages, tables of contents, or the names of author or publisher. These three works are by the late Dr. Niedner, of Berlin. They were never published, but printed for the use of the author's classes. They are partly preliminary and partly supplementary to his compendium of Church History, which has just appeared in a new and somewhat altered edition. Both the compendium and these treatises are remarkable examples of German comprehensiveness and compression. As a church historian, Niedner has never received, even in Germany, the full recognition and honor which his extraordinary attainments and especially his insight into history deserved. His style is at times harsh; he is fond of new combinations of words; and he affected an unusual, but still most exact, terminology. All that he published was in fact tentative and preparatory. But even in these preliminary labors, every thorough student will see the strength and skill of a real master in his art. No church historian can be compared with him in his faithful grasp and arrangement of the materials, and in the completeness with which he sketched all the main outlines—drew the plan—of his theme. In particular, the fineness of his discernment is most conspicuous in what we may call his historical generalizations,—his summing up and grouping of any given class of events, or of opinions. This summing up is made, not in the interest of an outside scheme or theory, nor in abstract formulas superimposed; but always in such a way (if you carefully study it,) as just to give the reality, as it then and there was, in its best terms and definitions, neither adding to it nor taking from it. It is, in its way, like the naturalist's description of an object, at once generic and specific. In this power, Niedner seems to us to be unrivalled; and this is essential to the highest historical representation of a subject, and is an index and proof of the truest impartiality on the part of the historian. Niedner's learning, too, was extraordinary; he studied the sources.

The great object he had in view as the completion of all his studies (as he expressed it in a letter,) was to give a combined history of philosophy and theology—believing this to be the only way of coming at the root of the matter. The first of the above named works was his preparation, the draft of this vast project, which now cannot be completed; for there is no living theologian or philosopher, who knows so much of both subjects, that he can finish what Niedner left incomplete. But the sketch, as we have it, is the best work of this kind extant. The compressed sketches of ancient and recent philosophy (above named) are also excellent in their way.

Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande. (*History of Logic in the Occident.*) Von Dr. CARL PRANTL. Vol. III., 1867. Professor Prantl, of Munich, carries on his History of Logic in the third volume of his work, (the first vol. was published in 1855, the second in 1861.) into the heart of the middle ages, and, at every stage, throws new light upon the principles and method of the scholastic philosophy. The controversy between realism and nominalism, it is safe to say, has never been so fully and acutely presented; and it cannot be understood without a study of these volumes. In respect to the relation of the scholastic philosophy to the Aristotelian writings, he has made what may fairly be considered as a discovery, (recognized as such by Kuno Fischer, of Jena, in the second edition of his *Logic and Metaphysics*, 1865,) that it is to be divided into two periods, the first dating from Boëthius, ("via antiqua,"), and the second from the Byzantine commentaries of Psellus, ("via moderna"). This third volume opens with an account of the first introduction of the Byzantine, Aristotelian and Arabic elaborations into the West, and brings to light the services of William Shyreswood, in adapting the Byzantine Logic to the Latin mind. Shyreswood was born at Durham, studied in Oxford, taught in Paris, and died A. D., 1249, chancellor of Lincoln. His merits are here for the first time fully appreciated. The work also gives account of the systems of Albertus Magnus, Gilbertus Porretanus, Raimund Lully, Dans Scotus, and many others, concluding with a thorough analysis of Occam. It is one of the monuments of German learning, a "life work," still to be continued.

Die Lehre von dem Gewissen, dargestellt von Dr. RUDOLPH HOFMANN. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1866, pp. 286. A good work on conscience, its nature and functions, its relations and history, has long been a desideratum; and Dr. Hofmann has ably met this need. It is altogether the most thorough, careful, and philosophical treatise on the subject, which has yet been published, grasping the matter right, and following it out in its various aspects with full learning and philosophical insight. The author neither identifies conscience with the religious sense; nor does he make it an infallible and ultimate dictator, as did Kant and the rationalists; nor yet does he treat it as a specific faculty, whose sole or chief function is to decide, by a kind of instinct, upon the character of our personal acts. Its primary function. (p. 83.) is a formal one, viz.: in any given case, there is an inward necessity laid upon us of asserting a definite relation; the relation, that is, between the given case, and a norm or rule, which at the same moment comes before the mind, (from within the mind,) and which claims from us an absolute authority. This rule or norm is primarily *formal*; its specific (*material*) contents are not given by conscience alone, nor even by reason alone. The bearings of this position we cannot at present even indicate; but must content ourselves with a mere summary of the work. The First Part treats of the Idea of Conscience in its Historical Development, in heathenism, under the Old Testament, in the Church and modern times (pp. 73); an excellent and well studied sketch. The Second Part is a Systematic Exhibition of the Doctrine of Conscience (pp. 74-236); discussing its nature, its obligatory element, its judicial and executive functions, its relation to the intellect, its "organic properties," its deteriorations, and its "redemption" by the power of the Christian faith. The Third Part, (pp. 237-284.) is on the

Practical Importance of Conscience, in respect to doctrine and life, including the freedom of conscience. All the recent German speculations, (Rothe, Hegel, Schenkel, Palmer, Schleiermacher, Delitzsch, etc.,) are criticised; but no English, (excepting Shakespeare,) or American writers are named.

Grammatical Synthesis. The Art of English Composition. By HENRY N. DAY. pp. 356. *The Art of Discourse: a System of Rhetoric.* By the same, pp. 343. New York: Scribner & Co., 1867. Professor Day has followed up his able work on Logic, which we have previously noticed, by a new and revised edition of his Rhetoric, first published in 1850; and by another book on the Art of English Composition; thus completing a series of manuals in this department of study. The peculiarity of these two last works consists in starting from thought, and then proceeding in a natural order to style. The thought is the main thing, and the laws of thought must be the controlling element. This point is developed in these treatises in a philosophical manner, and in an orderly method. They are unquestionably in advance, in this respect, of the current works on these subjects. The relations of Logic to both Rhetoric and Grammatical Synthesis, are also enforced at each step. The definitions and explanations are concise and lucid. All the topics ranging under these arts are presented in a sure method. Exercises are added for the training of the learner. We cordially commend these volumes to the notice of all teachers.

Observations on the Growth of the Mind. By SAMPSON REED. Seventh Edition. Chicago: Myers & Chandler, 1867, pp. 99. It is about forty years since this unpretending, yet most thoughtful, essay was published; and it is now for the first time clothed in a fitting vesture. Apart from the Swedenborgianism with which it is tinged, it is a treatise of rare merit, opening rich veins of thought, and composed in a remarkably pure style, studied yet simple. The attentive reader will find on almost every page fresh stimulus to new thoughts on old themes. It would not be difficult to cull from it some pages of pregnant aphorisms and beautiful analogies. The discussions upon Memory, Imagination, and Music, are imbued with the spirit of a wise philosophy. A profound reverence for the divine revelation animates and controls the development of the theme. Not scholastic in form, it is still progressive in method. The author may anticipate (in our view) too much from the progress of Swedenborgianism; but most of the positions he inculcates would survive even its decline, for they are grounded in nature, in reason, and in the Divine Word.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Old England: its Scenery, Art and People. By JAMES M. HOPPIN. New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1867, pp. 468. It is a real pleasure to pass through England in company with such a genial and cultivated observer as Professor Hoppin, of Yale College. He has a clear and open eye, and describes what he sees in a simple and felicitous diction. He introduces us to many of the bye-places of England, as well as to its great cities and other noted places. All can learn here of the men, and the arts, and the scenes of Old England, just what it is well to know. Any one who is to make the tour of England, could not do better than to take this book with him; and those who can not go abroad may make amends by reading these careful and pleasing descriptions.

Rural Studies with Hints for Country Places. By the author of "My Farm of Edgewood." New York: Scribner & Co., 1867, pp. 300. Mr.

Mitchell invests the most rugged and unpropitious themes with the charms of a delicate fancy and a finished style. In this volume he shows how the holders of a small country place can make it goodly to the eye as well as profitable to the purse. His suggestions, drawn from his own experience, are wise and simple. Any one, in following them out, will beautify his homestead, and give an impulse to a whole neighborhood. The volume is handsomely brought out.

Thrilling Adventures of DANIEL ELLIS. Written by Himself. With Illustrations. New York: Harpers, 1867, pp. 430. If Mr. Ellis had only kept out of the region of metaphor and mythology, in which so many worse men have also lost themselves, he might have written one of the most fascinating, special memoirs of our late war. Even as it is, the book is deeply interesting, and shows what this conflict really meant. It brings to light many of the romantic incidents in which the war abounded in those border States, where literally every man's hand was against his neighbor. Ellis was the noted Union guide of East Tennessee, and, for four years he was always at work, day and night, summer and winter, in conducting Union men through the lines to join the army of the Republic. His perils and escapes are truly marvellous. His recital of the barbarities inflicted on Union men, even now makes the blood tingle and leap. It hardly seems possible that we have just passed through such awful scenes. The name of Ellis will be ever invested with a romantic and patriotic interest.

Homespun; or, Five and Twenty Years Ago. By THOMAS LACKLAND. New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1867, pp. 346. It is a grateful relief to turn aside from the exciting scenes of most of our popular literature, and breathe the pure, simple and healthful air of country life, so charmingly described in this unpretentious volume. It tell us about Huckleberrying, and the Country Store, and the Town Meeting, and the Minister, and the Doctor, and the Hired Man, and the Barns, and Rainy Days, and the old Fire-Place, and Thanksgiving, and other good things, too numerous to be named.

Christie's Faith. By the author of "Mattie: a Stray," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, pp. 519. A healthful and capital story, well told.

The History of Pendennis. By WM. M. THACKERAY. New York: Harpers. 2 vols. in one, \$1.25. A cheap edition, in clear type, of Mr. Thackeray's admirable satire.

Black Sheep. A Novel. By EDMUND YATES. New York: Harper & Bros. No. 288 of Library of Select Novels. 50 cents.

Sowing the Wind. A Novel. By E. LYNN LYNTON, author of "Lizzie Lorton of Greyrigg," etc. No. 290 of Library of Select Novels. Harpers.

Nora and Archibald Lee. A Novel. By the author of "Agnes Tremorne," etc. New York: Harpers. No. 291 of Library of Select Novels.

Miss Ravenel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty. By J. W. DE FOREST. New York: Harper & Bros., 1867, pp. 521. This is said to be the

best novel yet written, illustrating the scenes of our recent conflict. It is published in good style.

The Last Chronicle of Barset. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. With Illustrations by Geo. H. Thomas. New York: Harper & Bros., 1867, pp. 362. One of the best of Mr. Trollope's novels.

Raymond's Heroine. A Novel. New York: Harper's. No. 292 Library of Select Novels. 50 cents, pp. 150.

Mr. Wynyard's Ward. A Novel. By HOLME LEE. New York: Harpers. No. 293, Library of Select Novels, 1867. 50 cents, pp. 106.

No Man's Friend. A Novel. By F. W. ROBINSON. Harpers. No. 295 of Select Novels. 75 cents.

Called to Account. A Novel. By MISS ANNIE THOMAS. No. 296 of Harper's Library of Select Novels. A bright and entertaining story.

Home Life: a Journal. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL, author of "Amy Herbert," etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1866. This is a simple and charming tale, illustrating some of the principles, and also the trials and discouragements, of education and life at home. It is pervaded by a deeply religious spirit.

College Life: its Theory and Practice. By STEPHEN OLIN, D. D., LL. D. New York: Harpers, 1867: Seven Lectures on the Theory and Practice of Scholastic Life, and four Baccalaureate Discourses, are republished in this volume, from Dr. Olin's works; and they are well worthy of being issued in a separate edition. The author was a wise and efficient President, as well as a thoughtful and eloquent preacher. The book is an excellent manual for college teachers and students.

THACKERAY'S *Lectures. The English Humorists. The Four Georges.* Complete in one volume. New York: Harpers, 1867. Another volume of the Harpers' cheap and well printed edition of Thackeray's work. The Lectures are admirable for their wit and wisdom.

The Culture demanded by Modern Life: a Series of Addresses and Arguments on the Claims of Scientific Education. With an Introduction by E. L. Youmans. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1867. The introductory essay, by Professor Youmans, is an able, though in some respects partial, discussion of the question of Mental Discipline in Education. We agree with him, that the object of education is not discipline alone; but we doubt whether a merely scientific education (in his sense of the phrase) will give either the highest discipline, or the chief and best materials, for the work of life. The times demand a broader culture, scientific and literary, philosophical and historical, and also moral and religious. In our educational theories we must keep up the harmony and union of the natural and the spiritual, of philosophy and faith. Some of our scientific men, in their reaction against the past, are unjust to it, and are running to the opposite extreme. But even they must be logicians; and their ultimate theories are metaphysical.

The volume also comprises an interesting and valuable series of essays, by Tyndale, Heffrey, Huxley, Faraday, Hodgson, Herbert Spencer and others. It is well worth reading by all who would know the signs of the times. The diatribe of Dr. Draper upon the Deficiencies of Clerical Education was hardly worth reprinting.

TEXT-BOOKS AND MISCELLANY.

Principia Latina, Part I. A First Latin Course, Comprehending Grammar, Delectus, and Exercise Book, with Vocabularies. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Revised by H. DRISLER, LL.D. 12mo., pp. xii and 189. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1863.

Principia Latina, Part II. A First Latin Reading Book. Containing an epitome of Cæsar's Gallic Wars, and Lhomond's Lives of Distinguished Romans, with a Short Introduction to Roman Antiquities, Notes and a Dictionary. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D., and H. DRISLER, LL.D. 12mo., pp. xxiv and 375. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1866.

Many of the books prepared for the use of Schools in England, have been reproduced in this country, with omissions and alterations indeed, but few with such valuable additions and improvements as the American Editor, Dr. Drisler, has made in the work before us, especially in the Second Part.

These books are intended as a sufficient introduction to Latin Prose. The First Part presents the Grammatical Terms, with Exercises in double translation, and the simpler Rules of Syntax interspersed, then the more difficult points of Syntax, followed by Extracts from Cæsar, with two Indexes to the vocabularies, one of the Latin and the other of English words. The alterations, in this volume, are chiefly in point of arrangement for greater convenience, and the additions are the Rules of Prosody, and the Extracts from Cæsar. The Second Part, consists of Extracts from Cæsar and Lhomond, *De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romæ*, or *Viri Romæ*, as we usually designate it. In this Part, Dr. Drisler has made great improvements, partly by judicious alterations and partly by valuable additions. He has prefixed to the work the first Part of an Essay, by Prof. P. Halls, of the University of Edinburgh, on the Latin authors read in Schools, and on the want of Elementary reading books among the ancient Romans. This Essay is useful and entertaining. For the Extracts from Jacobs' and Döring's Reader, he has substituted Dr. Woodford's Epitome of Cæsar. It is in the notes to this portion of the book that the labor of Dr. Drisler most conspicuously appears; and while he can not be said to have neglected the wants of the mere tyro, he has introduced much valuable matter, which will accustom the young mind to raise difficult questions, and teach it how to answer them, and, if we mistake not, will throw light now and then on a point obscure to older heads. We specify a few of the important matters in this part of the work. In pp. 134, 136, 140, 141, special attention is called to the peculiar use and arrangement of words in Cæsar; in pp. 143, 144, rules are given for the use of the *Oratio obliqua* with illustrations; in pp. 147, 167, the force of plural nouns is pointed out, and in p. 166, the preference of the Latin for the verbal construction; and elsewhere we find the different uses of the ablative absolute indicated, with the proper mode of rendering each, remarks on accuracy of translation, on the Quantity of Syllables, on the proper use of the Subjunctive, and on the force of Prepositions. The *Viri Romæ* also is annotated with fulness and accuracy. The boy who carefully studies these notes of this book, and applies the principles they develop, will acquire a good fund of grammatical knowledge, while from this summary of Cæsar, he will gain such an insight into his style,

and the subject-matter of his work, that he may proceed to read understandingly the *Bellum Gallicum* in its full and unabridged forms; and from the *Viri Romæ* he will acquire a *copia verborum*, and a more useful knowledge of Roman History than he would from any of the ordinary historical manuals, with this special advantage, that he will thus associate the very words of the Romans with his knowledge of their life. The vocabulary appended has been very carefully revised, and in its present form is a competent aid to those reading the book. We are glad to see so much attention given in it to the derivation and composition of the words—a matter that should be brought under the student's notice at the outset, and kept up throughout his course of study—and under this head we find not only the common and obvious facts of the language, but some very curious and interesting matter.

We congratulate the school-boy and the teacher on this addition, from so able and experienced a hand, to our helps in learning the Classics; and hope that it will bear good fruit in promoting the study of those great works, in the study of which all the greatest scholars of modern times have attained their highest literary culture. C. S.

The Public Debt of the United States. Its Organization; its Liquidation; Administration of the Treasury; the Financial System. By J. S. GIBBONS, author of "The Banks of New York." Chs. Scribner & Co., 1867, pp. 276. All who wish to understand the origin, growth and present state of our overshadowing national debt, will find ample materials, well arranged, in this clear and instructive volume. The author criticizes our financial policy with great sharpness and severity, finding little to praise in Chase, or McCulloch, or Congress. But it is always easier to see the defects of the past than to provide the best remedy for the future. It is certainly difficult for us to see how the war could have been carried on with the continuance of specie payments; the nation had to throw itself on its future credit rather than to rely on its present capital. Mr. Gibbons is inconsistent in his statements about the amount of our present currency; putting it, p. 148, at \$517,000,000, and four pages further on, correctly, at \$717,000,000. We are not satisfied with his reasons for an indefinite postponement of the payment of the debt, though we agree with him, that specie payment should be resumed as speedily as possible. Until this is done, we are not safe. The main thing is, to have the taxation rightly arranged. It is now in a deplorable state. An appendix gives a succinct account of the state of the British debt.

The Bankrupt Law of the United States, 1867. By EDWIN JAMES. New York: Harpers, 1867. Mr. James, now of the New York Bar, was one of the framers of the recent English Bankruptcy Amendment Act, and is well qualified to expound the law on this subject. This he does, in relation to the recent needed and beneficial Act of Congress, in the form of notes on each section of the Act, with a collection of all the British and American decisions upon the questions involved. The work is highly spoken of in the legal profession. It makes a substantial octavo volume of 325 pages.

Harpers' Hand-Book for Travellers in Europe and the East, edited by W. P. FERRIDGE, appears in its Sixth Year, and is well got up. It is one of the most useful and convenient works of its class, and has improved from year to year.

Plutarch on the Delay of the Deity in Punishing the Wicked. Revised Edition, with Notes, by Professors H. B. HACKETT and W. S. TYLER. New York: Appleton & Co., 1867. Plutarch's argument against the Epicurean scepticism carries the vindication of the Divine government, in respect to the delay in the punishment of the wicked, to as high a point as was ever attained outside of a positive revelation. It helps also to refute those who say that the light of natural reason is not to be trusted at all on these high themes. It is worthy of repeated study; and we are glad to see this new edition brought out in good style, with notes and explanation, by two competent editors. All theological students ought to read with it, Prof. Tyler's admirable articles on Plutarch in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*.

History of the Panama Railroad; and of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. By F. M. ORIS, M. D. New York: Harper & Bros., 1867, pp. 317. This work is fully illustrated with engravings, maps, etc., and answers the purpose of a guide-book, as well as a history of this important railroad and the country it traverses.

An Elementary Treatise on American Grape Culture and Wine Making. By PETER B. MEAD. Illustrated with nearly two hundred engravings, drawn from Nature. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1867, pp. 483. Those familiar with the subject say that this is the simplest and best treatise on the culture of grapes in this country. It is printed and illustrated in excellent style.

Annual of Scientific Discovery for 1866 and 1867. Edited by SAMUEL KNEELAND, M. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, pp. 370. Mr. Wells, who has conducted this work for fifteen years, has been appointed U. S. Commissioner of Revenue, and is succeeded by Dr. Kneeland as editor. The latter, in his Preface, gives a concise account of recent scientific investigations and discoveries, with an evident leaning to the more advanced positions in respect to the antiquity of the race, the Darwinian hypothesis and the like. The first article is on the Atlantic Telegraph, chiefly from Mr. Field's account. All the recent discoveries are presented in clear descriptions. The work is indispensable to one who wishes to keep up with the rapid progress of the physical sciences.

Report on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States and Canada, made to the Legislature of New York, 1867. By E. C. WINES, D. D., LL. D., and THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL. D. Albany, 1867, pp. 547. Dr. Wines and Professor Dwight have done an excellent service in the preparation of this thorough and comprehensive Report. It is one of the most important documents on this subject that has ever been presented to our Legislature. It is elaborately arranged, and covers all the ground. Its suggestions, too, for the reform of our Prisons are wise and humane. They must be freed from the control of mere politicians, if they are to answer their great end. Our space forbids us at present to enter more fully into this work, but we hope soon to publish an article on the subject.

INDEX TO VOL. V, NEW SERIES, 1867.

- Adams, F. A. Notes on Passages of Scripture, 103-108.
- Alford, Henry, Queen's English, 342.
- American Tract Societies, New York and Boston, books noticed, 176, 668.
- Ancient and Modern Liberty, 459-483.
- Annual of Discovery, noticed, 678.
- Ante-Nicene Christian Library, 338, 666.
- Ayre, John, Treasury of Bible, 172.
- Bain, English Composition, 345.
- Bancroft, George, Hist. of U. S., 178; on Joseph Reed, 669.
- Barnes, Albert, Historical Evidence as affected by Time, p. 189-216; on Thomas Brainard, 77-103.
- Bartlett, Samuel C., Life and Death Eternal, noticed, 171.
- Beauty, Nature of, 391-419.
- Beethoven's Letters, noticed, 343.
- Bernard, Progress of Doctrine, 487.
- Berry, J. R., Vows of Scripture, 419-437.
- Bibelwerk, Bunsen's, noticed, 338.
- Bittinger, J. B., Greetings of Paul, 55-77; 295-314.
- Booth, R. R., Relation of Missions to Christianity, 437-458.
- Brainerd, Rev. Thomas, 77-103.
- Brown, J. B., Home Life, noticed, 177.
- Butler, C. M., Ritualism of Laws, 340.
- Calkins, Vision Theory of Resurrection, 349-376; 517-533.
- Campbell, S. M., Christianity and Civil Liberty, 377-390.
- Clarke, James Freeman, Orthodoxy, noticed, 171.
- Clement of Alexandria, 666.
- Cowles, Minor Prophets, noticed, 176.
- Creds, Art on, by Rev, J. F. Kendall, 605-624.
- Crosby, Howard, New Testament Annotations, 160-165.
- Curtis, T. F., on Inspiration, 667.
- Dale, James W., Classic Baptism, 335.
- Damalas, Treatise on Principles, 484.
- Davis, Henry Winter, Speeches, 341.
- D'Aubigné, Reformation, noticed, 178.
- Day, H. N., Logic, noticed, 340, 494-6; Art of Composition, noticed, 673; Article on the Nature of Beauty, 391-419.
- Demarest, J. T., Christocracy, 486.
- De Vere, Schell, Studies in English, noticed, 342.
- Divine Names in the Hebrew, 268-297.
- Draper, J. W., Civil War in America, noticed, 670.
- Draytons and Davenants, noticed, 344.
- Episcopacy, Growth and Origin of, 133-159.
- Evangelical Alliance, Report to, by H. B. Smith, 555-592.
- Extemporaneous Preaching, 9-27.
- Forgiveness, Christian, Article on, by Rev. Artemas Dean, 533-544.
- France, Intelligence, 183-499.
- Fronde, England, noticed, 179, 669.
- Fuller, J. G., The Brownings, 345.
- Garbett, Ed., on Inspiration, 487.
- Germany, Intelligence, 182, 346, 497.
- Gibbons, Debt of U. S., noticed, 677.
- Great Britain, Intelligence, 184, 504-505.
- Greece, Intelligence, 503.
- Greetings of Paul, 55-77; 298-314.
- Markness, Albert, Latin Book, 345.
- Heard, J. B., Tripartite Nature of Man, noticed, 336.
- Historical Evidence as affected by Time, by A. Barnes, p. 189-216.
- Hitchcock, R. D., Growth and Origin of Episcopacy, 133-159.
- Hodgson on Time and Space, 217-238.
- Hofmann, Lehre von Gewissen, 672.
- Holland, Intelligence, 502.
- Hopkin, Prof., Old England, 673.
- Howells, W. D., Venetian Life, 344.
- Howland, Joseph, Translation of Laboulaye on Ancient and Modern Liberty, 459-483.
- Intelligence, Literary and Theological, 182-184; 346; 487-506.
- Irenaeus and Infant Baptism, 239-267.
- Irving, Washington, Spanish Papers, noticed, 344.
- Italy, Intelligence, 503.
- Jacobus, Notes on Genesis, noticed, 337.
- Kendall, Rev. J. F., Art. on Church Creds, 605-624.
- Kerr, Samuel D., Jewish Church, noticed, 175.
- Kuria in the Second Epistle of John, 166-170.
- Laboulaye, Edouard, Ancient and Modern Liberty, 459-483; Tales of all Nations, noticed, 343.
- Lange, Commentary, noticed, 175, 491.
- Laurent, J. C. M., Kuria in the Second Epistle of John, 166-170.
- Liber Librorum, noticed, 487.
- Lord, Eleazar, Divine Names in the Scriptures, 268-297.

INDEX.

- Masson, David, Recent British Philosophy, 340.
- McClelland, Alexander, Sermons by, noticed, 336.
- McClintock, John, Cyclopædia, 491.
- Merivale, Northern Nations, 179.
- Milman, History of Christianity, noticed, 178.
- Missions and Christianity, 437-458.
- Mitchell, his Doctor Johns, noticed, 181; Rural Studies, noticed, 673.
- Mombert's translation of Lange, 491.
- Morris, George S. review of Hodgson, 217-238.
- Muenschner, Joseph. Book of Proverbs, noticed, 337; on Interpretation, 488.
- New Testament Annotations, 160-165.
- Newton, Richard, Great Pilot, noticed, 345.
- Niedner, Works of, noticed, 671.
- Notes on Difficult Passages of Scripture, 103-108.
- Notes on recent Books, 171-181; 335-245; 484-494; 666-678.
- Olin, College Life, noticed, 675.
- Osgood, Samuel, American Leaves, noticed, 341.
- Palgrave, Francis, on Art, noticed, 342.
- Parish Preachings, Lecture on, 108-132.
- Phelps, Austin, New Birth, noticed, 171.
- Plumer, W. S., Studies in the Psalms, noticed, 173.
- Plutarch on Delay of Deity, etc., noticed, 678.
- Pond, Enoch, Theology, noticed, 666.
- Powers, Wm. R., Irenæus and Infant Baptism, 239-267.
- Prantl, Geschichte d. Logik, 672.
- Presbyterian Publication Committee, Books of, noticed, 177, 668.
- President and Congress, 28-55.
- Principia Latina, noticed, 676.
- Progressive Apprehension of Divine Truth, Art. on, by Seelye, 592-605.
- Public Schools, 314-334.
- Quackenbos, G. P., Arithmetic, noticed, 345.
- Quesnel, The Gospels, noticed, 491.
- Randolph, A. D. F., Poems, noticed, 343.
- Resurrection, Vision Theory of, 349-376; 517-533.
- Reunion, Presbyterian, Art. on, by Prof. Smith, 623-655.
- Rise and Fall, noticed, 171.
- Ritter, Carl, Palestine, noticed, 493.
- Rothe, Ethics, noticed, 485.
- Rural Studies, noticed, 673.
- Russia, Intelligence, 502.
- Sadler, M. F., Emmanuel, noticed, 335.
- Schaeffer, C. F., Transl. of Lange, 175.
- Schaff, Philip, History of the Christian Church, noticed, 338; Lange's Commentary, edited by, noticed, 175.
- Scott, W. A., The Christ of the Creed, noticed, 486.
- Seelye, Prof. J. H., Article on Progressive Apprehension of Truth, 592-605.
- Sewell, Mias, Home Life, noticed, 675.
- Shedd, Wm. G. T., Extemporaneous Preaching, 9-27; Homiletics, 485.
- Skinner, Thomas, on Parish Preaching, 108-132.
- Smith, H. B., Translation, 166-171; Report to Evang. Alliance, 555-592; Art. on Reunion, 623-665.
- Smith, Wm., Bible Dictionary, 493.
- South, Robert, Sermons, noticed, 335.
- Spain, Intelligence, 503.
- Spear, Samuel T., President and Congress, 28-55.
- Spurgeon, Morning by Morning, noticed, 177.
- Squier, Autobiography, noticed, 670.
- Stone, John S., Christian Sacraments, noticed, 336.
- Switzerland, Intelligence, 501.
- Tenny, W. J., Grammatical Analyzer, noticed, 345.
- Thackeray, Lectures, noticed, 675.
- Tischendorf's Vatican New Testament, 489.
- Trench, Abp., on Gospels, 490.
- Trollope, The Claverings, noticed, 346.
- Tyler, W. S., Theology of Greek Poets, noticed, 667.
- United States, Intelligence, 506.
- Van Osterzee in Lange, 491.
- Vatican New Testament, 489.
- Vision Theory of the Resurrection of Christ, 349-376; 517-533.
- Vows of Scripture, 419-437.
- Wesley, Chs., Poems, noticed, 343.
- Wines, on Prisons, noticed, 678.
- Winslow, Mrs. Mary, Correspondence, 177.
- Women of the Gospels, by Mrs. Charles, noticed, 344.
- Youmans, Modern Culture, 675.
- Young, Life and Light of Men, 172.

Grover & Baker's

FIRST PREMIUM ELASTIC STITCH FAMILY

Sewing Machines

495 BROADWAY,
NEW YORK.



Points of Excellence.

- Beauty and Elasticity of Stitch.
- Perfection and Simplicity of Machinery.
- Using both threads direct from the spools.
- No fastening of seams by hand and no waste of thread.
- Wide range of application without change of adjustment.
- The seam retains its beauty and firmness after washing and ironing.

Besides doing all kinds of work done by other Sewing Machines, these Machines execute the most beautiful and permanent Embroidery and ornamental work.

"I have had several years' experience with a Grover & Baker Machine, which has given me great satisfaction. Its chief merit is that it makes a strong elastic stitch; it is very easily kept in order, and without much fatigue, which I think is a very great recommendation. I am not very familiar with any other machine, except a Wheeler & Wilson, which I have had. I think the Grover & Baker Machine is more easily managed, and less liable to get out of order. I prefer the Grover & Baker, decidedly."—*Testimony of Mrs. Dr. Watts, of New York, before the Commissioner of Patents.*

Association.

"There could be no greater comfort in a family than a Grover & Baker Sewing Machine. I have used one for the last nine or ten years, and I think it is decidedly the best family Sewing Machine. It requires more skill to work other machines than the Grover & Baker."—*Testimony of Mrs. Alice B. Whipple, wife of the Rev. Dr. Whipple, Secretary American Missionary Association.*

"I find the Grover & Baker stitch will wear as long as the garments do—outwear the garment, in fact. The stitch will not break on bias seams, when stretched, as others do, and neither does it draw the work. I can use it from the thickest woollen cloth to Nanook muslin, changing nothing but the needle and using a different size thread."—*Testimony of Mrs. Dr. Whipple, 4 East 24th Street, New York, before the Commissioner of Patents.*

"I like the Grover & Baker Machine, in the first place, because if I had any other I should still want a Grover & Baker, and having a Grover & Baker, it answers the purpose of all the rest. It does a greater variety of work, and it is easier to learn than any other. I know three other ladies who have sold off other machines—sold at reduced prices—in order to get a Grover & Baker, but recently, and they are very enthusiastic about their new machines."—*Testimony of Mrs. J. C. Croly (Jennie June) before the Commissioner of Patents.*

American Presbyterian and Theological Review.

THE next number will begin a new Volume, and will be published on the first of January. The price will remain \$3, to all who pay on or before the issue of the first number.

We send bills in the present number to such of our subscribers as are in arrears. A PROMPT remittance is respectfully and urgently solicited.

WANTED:

The January number of 1865, for which 75 cents will be paid on delivery.

TERMS:

THREE DOLLARS, if paid strictly in advance; \$3.50 after three months; and \$4 at the end of the year.

FOR SALE:

One or two complete sets, and nearly all the numbers singly, of the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, the AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, and of the PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.



GET THE BEST
Webster's Unabridged Dictionary,
NEW ILLUSTRATED EDITION,
Thoroughly Revised and Enlarged.
OVER 3000 FINE ENGRAVINGS.
10,000 WORDS and MEANINGS not found in other
Dictionaries.

A necessity to every intelligent family, student, teacher, and professional man. What library a complete without the English Dictionary.

"Superior, in most respects, to any other English Dictionary known to me."—Hon. George P. Marsh, March, 1866

"In our opinion, it is the best Dictionary that either England or America can boast."—National Quarterly Review.

"In its general accuracy, completeness, and practical utility, the work is one which none who can read or write can henceforward afford to dispense with."—Atlantic Monthly.

"Viewed as a whole, we are confident that no other living language has a dictionary which so fully and faithfully sets forth its present condition as this last editor of Webster does that of our written and spoken English tongue."—Harper's Magazine.

"THE NEW WEBSTER is glorious—it is perfect—it distances and defies competition—it leaves nothing to be desired."—J. H. Raymond, LL.D., President of Vassar College.

"All young persons should have a standard Dictionary at their elbows. And while you are about it GET THE BEST; that Dictionary is NOAH WEBSTER'S—the great work unabridged. If you are too poor, save the amount from off your back to put it into your head."—Ph Journal.

"Every farmer should give his sons two or three square rods of ground, well prepared, with the avails of which they may buy it. Every mechanic should put a receiving box in some conspicuous place in the house to catch the stray pennies for the like purpose. Lay it upon your table by the side of the Bible; it is a better expounder than many which claim to be exponents. It is a great labor-saver; it has saved us time enough in one year's use to pay for itself; and that must be deemed good property which will clear itself in one year. If you have any doubt about the precise meaning of the word clear in last sentence, look at Webster's nine definitions of the *v. t.*"

Massachusetts Life Boat.

In one vol. of 1,840 Royal Quarto Pages.

Published by G. & C. MERRIAM, Springfield, Mass. Sold by all Booksellers.

r.

st of
first

ars.

the

BIAN
OOI-

y.

S.

er

a

rah,

onal

can

ally

ten

oth-

out

oor,

the

nce

the

; it

erly

lear